SCIENCE AND PRAYER
AND OTHER PAPERS

GALUSHA ANDERSON, S.T.D., LL.D.

SCIENCE AND PRAYER

SCIENCE AND PRAYER AND OTHER PAPERS

BY

GALUSHA ANDERSON, S.T.D., LL.D.

Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago.

Joint-translator of Asterius' Sermons, Ancient Sermons for Modern Times; author of The Story of a Border City during the Civil War; Hitherto Untold; and When Neighbors were Neighbors.

At eve hold not thy hand.
— Montgomery.

THE PILGRIM PRESS

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

THE PILGRIM PRESS
BOSTON

TO THOSE WHO, IN FORMER DAYS,
SAT AS STUDENTS IN MY CLASSROOM AND FOR WHOM
LOVE, WITH EVER-INCREASING WARMTH, GLOWS
IN MY HEART, THIS VOLUME
IS AFFECTIONATELY
DEDICATED.

FOREWORD

The essays contained in this volume are chosen from among many on account of the permanent and vital importance of the themes discussed in them. Some of them have never before been published, but a part of them have appeared from time to time in periodicals or in pamphlet form.

The first, which furnishes the leading title of this book, was prepared, at the request of the editor, for *The North American Review.* At the time not a few scientists were stoutly contending, since the laws of nature are immutable, that the belief that God answers prayer for rain or the recovery of the sick is not only untenable but even preposterous. And some such scientists still linger among us.

The second paper, written only a few months ago, is an effort to free the doctrine of the atonement of all arbitrary elements and to interpret on natural and scientific grounds what the Scriptures say of the sufferings of Christ.

The Supreme End of Theological Schools is an address delivered before *The Robinson Rhetorical Society* at the semi-centennial of *The Rochester Theological Seminary.*

The interpretation of John 21:15-17 was presented at the Eighth Conference, held at All Saints Memorial Church, Providence, R. I. May

11th, 1904, on the Gospel of John. It afterwards appeared in the volume entitled *Addresses on the Gospel of St. John.*

The generosity of the editors of *The North American Review,* in permitting me to include among the papers of this volume *Science and Prayer,* is warmly appreciated. Also the courtesy of the editors of *The Review and Expositor,* in permitting me to transfer to these pages the essay on *The Atonement through Sympathy* is gratefully acknowledged.

My cockle-shell is launched with some misgiving. May a kind Providence steer her clear of destructive mines, shield her from bombs dropped from the upper air, from torpedoes shot from the depths beneath and give her a prosperous voyage!

Galusha Anderson.

Newtonville, Mass.

CONTENTS

SCIENCE AND PRAYER

SCIENCE AND PRAYER

God made man in his own image. God and man are kin. On account of this kinship it is as natural for man to resort to God in prayer as it is for a child to ask a gift of an earthly father whom he loves and in whom he confides. Jesus Christ, the peerless, the Son of God, prayed and taught his disciples to pray. Without so much as the shadow of a doubt he said, "And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." (Matt 21 : 22.)

But, in our day, a class of able men, many of them distinguished scientists, think that the biblical view of prayer is altogether false; that it will do well enough for children and ignorant men and women, but can no longer satisfy the intelligent and the learned. These men represent prayer as futile, because the laws of the material universe are absolutely immutable—nothing can in the least change or modify them; therefore, to pray for rain or for recovery from sickness is as great a folly as it would be to attempt to dam up Niagara with a straw. When the atmospheric conditions are fulfilled, the rain will descend; when the physical and hygienic conditions are suitable, the sick will be restored to health. But these scientists do not all agree in opinion any

more than the theologians do. Some of them are theists: their God is a personal God, who hears prayer. He may, they affirm, in answer to prayer, bestow on men spiritual blessings. If they pray for enlightenment, the spirit illuminates their minds; if for forgiveness of sin, that blessing is bestowed and the assurance of it; but, say they, we cannot rationally pray for physical good, for material blessings, since in the material realm all is governed by laws fixed, unchangeable.

Still others affirm that prayer is a rational exercise, not because the petitioner directly receives in answer to his prayer either spiritual or material good, but on account of the reflex influence of prayer upon his own mind and heart. It changes him. It lifts him up into communion with Him in whom is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning." No real answer to prayer comes down from God to us, but by prayer we are lifted up toward God and transformed into his likeness. That there is this reflex influence in prayer, no candid observer can for a moment doubt; but that this is all that is implied in answer to prayer, we are not yet ready to admit.

Such, then, are the views, not of all, but of many of the scientists of our day. Whatever may be the diversities in their views, there is substantial agreement in this, that the immutability of the laws of nature shows the folly of prayer, especially for material blessings. That such views are at variance with the Scriptures, the dullest can see. Both the biblical view and this of the materialistic

scientists cannot be true; they are utterly at variance with each other, absolutely contradictory. Christ says with positiveness and with sweeping generality, "Ask, and it shall be given you"; the scientist says it is folly to ask, as no blessing, since the laws of the material universe are immutable, can be bestowed in direct answer to prayer. It is clear, then, that either Christ is mistaken or the materialistic scientists are.

We wish, "with malice toward none and with charity for all," to call attention to some points in the position of those scientists, who have essayed to be not only our scientific, but also our religious teachers, which seem to us to be weak and untenable; and by our tentative criticism to suggest that perchance the soundest science does not yet summon us to abandon the biblical view of prayer; that it is quite possible that he who spake, his enemies being the judges, as never man spake, never dropped a word in reference to prayer which conflicts in any degree with absolute science. The question before us, then, is whether the doctrine of prayer as presented by Christ in the New Testament is at variance with established science.

Let us first briefly define our terms. What is science? It is what we really know in all departments of investigation, whether the subject be the material universe or the acts and states of the soul revealed to us through consciousness. To know scientifically, to be sure, implies accurate observation, analysis, generalization, and correct classification; but all these processes simply help

us really to know, and *to know* is the pith of the signification of the term science.

An honest, rigid application of this definition would reduce many ponderous volumes on science to the compass of books fitted to take their place in some vest-pocket series. Much of so-called science is nothing but theories or hypotheses to account for phenomena which everywhere confront us, many of which still remain unexplained. We do not object to these hypotheses as such; they are good in their place. They are the tools with which scientific men do their work. All advancement in scientific knowledge has been made by using them; but until proved to be true, they are no more science than the chisel with which the sculptor works is the statue which he brings forth from the marble. We must make a sharp distinction between science, that which is absolutely known, and hypothesis, by means of which we strive to know.

On the other hand, what is prayer? It would not specially serve our purpose to attempt a comprehensive definition of it; but we wish to call attention to a single element which should enter into every just definition of prayer. It must be manifest to any one who thinks at all, that men are dependent beings. In the family, in society, and in business, we all, to a greater or less extent, lean on one another, children on their parents, wives on their husbands, the ignorant and the weak on the learned and the strong, the poor on the rich and the rich on the poor. Now, lying at

the very core of prayer is the fact of our dependence on God. By asking blessings of him we confess that dependence; and in this confession of dependence we not only submit our weakness to his strength, but our ignorance to his wisdom. We ask, conscious that we may make grievous mistakes in asking, so that the innermost spirit of true prayer is the submission of the petitioner to God. The cry of Christ in Gethsemane, as he prayed in agony that the cup might pass from him, "Not my will but thine be done," is the undertone of all genuine prayer; so that God answers us truly, when, instead of giving us what we ask, he gives us rather the thing which, in his wisdom, he sees that we need.

The real difficulty in the way of God's answering prayer, according to some able scientists, is, as has already been noted, the fact that the laws of the material universe are absolutely unchangeable. This has led some theistic scientists to affirm that prayer for spiritual blessings may be answered, while prayer for physical good—for example, for rain in time of drought—is folly. But if fixity of law makes prayer for physical good absurd, it must make equally foolish prayer for spiritual blessings, since law is just as fixed in the realm of mind or spirit as in the realm of matter. The laws by which the mind is developed are just as immutable as the laws by which the oak is unfolded from the acorn; the laws by which we think are as rigid and fixed as those which regulate the rivers in their flow or the clouds

which sweep across the sky. If, on account of the fixedness of law, it is absurd to pray for rain, it is for the same reason equally absurd to pray that the divine Spirit may illuminate our minds and guide our thoughts. If, then, God may answer prayer for spiritual gifts, he may, in spite of the unchangeableness of law, answer prayer for physical blessings.

But we also suggest that the position which we combat is probably untenable, on the ground that these able scientists do not, in stating their objections to prayer, use the term law with that precision of meaning that is requisite in scientific discussion. Sometimes they personify it. It seems clothed with personality, as when they tell us that the laws of nature do this and that. They often deify it, ascribing to it attributes which the devout theist ascribes only to God. This is the method of poetry rather than of science. Every thinker knows that the term law has several distinct meanings. It will be sufficient for our purpose to note barely two. We call attention to the first simply because of its diversity from the second, so that by the contrast we may add to the vividness of the second meaning, on which we propose to comment. First, we speak of moral law. It is distinguished by oughtness. We are so made that we discern a distinction between right and wrong; we know intuitively that they are opposites. Men universally recognizing this distinction feel that they ought to do the right and shun the wrong. This ought is mightier than all other forces which

impel men to action. This distinction of right from wrong, and the oughtness which presses a man, as with the superincumbent weight of a mountain, to do the right, constitute the essence of moral law. Bentham, in his utilitarian argument in reference to morals, was so troubled with this element of oughtness that he declared that the word ought "ought to be banished from the vocabulary of morals." From the inexorable necessities of his own being he could not *say it* in any other way.

Now, when we come to talk of the laws of the material universe, we have in mind a very different conception. No oughtness appears. We mean simply the processes of nature,—the ways in which things, so far as the observation of men has extended, come to pass. When the cold reaches a given degree of intensity, water freezes; we say that that is a material law. When the higher temperature of spring comes, the ice melts and vegetation starts; we call these processes laws. When vapor freezes, it takes the form of crystals; and this process we call a material law. The profoundest scientist cannot carry his analysis any further . He knows more than a clown or a child only because, by study and extended observation, he has seen more of the processes of nature, and has generalized and grouped them. In any single example, he can only see what the ignorant may see,—that a law of nature is simply the way in which a thing, in the material world or in the world of mind, is done.

Now, since in these varied laws of nature we see that certain useful ends are met, the suggestion inevitably comes that intelligence established these laws or now works out these varied and beneficent processes. Since a law of nature is nothing more than the way in which a certain thing is accomplished, it is assuredly not contrary to anything which science has discovered to consider the laws of nature simply as God's ways of doing things. Such a supposition does no violence to scientific method, while it provides a suitable cause for the beneficent element in these laws. If it is asked why these processes, or laws of nature, on the supposition that they are God's ways of working, are fixed, invariable, we find a ready answer in the biblical revelation of God's nature and character. Being absolutely perfect, when, for the first time, he did anything, he did it with absolute perfection. When a thing is perfect, there can be no change for the better, since nothing can be any more than perfect; and God cannot change the processes of nature, so that they would be in any sense imperfect, since that would be a contradiction of his own absolute perfection. We find therefore in the character of God, as presented to us in the Bible, the sufficient reason for the immutability of natural laws, when we regard them as simply his methods of acting. So when David sang, "The Lord also thundered in the heavens, and the highest gave his voice," he did not even in his imaginative song utter anything opposed to the strictest science; in such

diction, poetry and science "met together" and "kissed each other." And since these processes of nature may, without the slightest conflict with science, be considered simply the actings of God immanent in his own creation, it is not impossible that, working by these unchangeable processes, he may answer the prayers of his children.

And it will not be difficult for us to discover by analogy how, in perfect harmony with the fact of the immutability of natural laws, God may do this. The perfect confidence of men in the fixity of natural laws underlies all their acts. Without such confidence they never would construct or work the simplest machinery. They would not dare to sail lake or ocean, lest by a change of natural laws their vessel should suddenly sink rather than float. But because they know these laws to be immutable, they use them with confidence in all their manifold activities. Now, from analogy, we are able to see how the immutability of natural laws, instead of being an obstacle standing in the way of God's answering prayer, may become rather the very means by which he answers every prayer of faith. Men, because these natural laws are unchangeable, are able, by the adjustment to each other of even a very few of them, to secure the most wonderful results. The adjustment to each other of a few immutable laws gives us the steam-engine, which moves most of the machinery of the civilized nations. The adjustment of a few immutable laws drives our great merchant ships around the globe. The bird which

darts upward into the air and onward through it with such great velocity, instinctively adjusts a few unchangeable laws to bring about this surprising result. If men, with their limited knowledge, and the birds of the air by instinct, can use unchangeable laws to reach such marvelous and varied results, can not God, who established these laws, so adjust them to each other as to answer every true prayer breathed into his ear? Immutability of law, then, does not make prayer even for physical blessings a folly, but rather suggests to us how God, because of this very immutability, may answer every true petition.

Then we are never to forget that at the best we know but little. La Place is reported to have said, just before he died, "What we do not know is enormous." We have discovered, by centuries of toil, a few natural laws. As the circle of our knowledge has widened, we have become aware of still greater regions just beyond, that no human mind has ever explored. And in the future, as our knowledge extends, we shall ever grow more and more keenly alive to the infinite reaches of being and of law which we do not know. What we know of the laws of the material universe compared with what we do not know, is like the handful of sand in the hour-glass compared with the vast Sahara. If man, with his very limited knowledge of unchangeable laws, can by their adjustment to each other achieve so much, who shall limit in his achievements Him who understands all laws, and who, by the simple act of his will, can

adjust these myriads of laws to each other so as to satisfy the cry of every one of his creatures?

Moreover, those who have arrayed science and prayer against each other have sometimes complacently sneered at those who still believe that God answers prayer as being honest enough, but pitiably unscientific. Now, such men ought not to complain, if we demand of them what they demand of others. No theory designed to account for any class of phenomena is worth anything unless it takes into consideration all the known facts and makes suitable provision for them. Those who contend that, on the basis of the immutability of natural laws, it is folly to pray, have never in their theory made full provision for the entire content of the fact of prayer. If one thing in reference to man has been established beyond every other, it is the fact that he has distinctively a religious nature. Wherever found, be he savage or civilized, he is religious. He universally has his places of worship, rude or artistic; he has his shrines and altars, and offers to his god or gods sacrifices bloody or unbloody. Heathen, Mohammedan, and Christian alike pray. Even men who declare themselves atheists will sometimes pray, when they get into a pinch; and in their highest and best moods will utter words of praise to Him whom they declare not to exist. Now, a fact so universal as prayer must be in some way accounted for. Does it not carry the evidence in itself that there is an answer to it? We find it to be a general law of our being that satisfaction

is provided for every natural and right desire. We hunger,—without us are manifold harvests and barns bursting with plenty; we thirst,—without us are lakes, bubbling fountains and purling brooks; we long for the beautiful,—without us in myriads of objects is beauty more subtle and delicate than was ever expressed by the brush of the painter or the pen of the poet; we crave the sublime,—and cataract, and mountain, and heaving ocean, and the awful storm, answer the inward desire. As, in these cases, the hunger, the thirst, the longing, and the craving are evidences within us of the satisfaction without us, so prayer, the deep longing or craving of man's religious nature, carries with it the decisive evidence that there is without an answer which will meet and satisfy it. If this be not so, then for our physical and intellectual cravings answers beautiful and complete have been provided, while the cravings of our higher religious nature have been left uncared for and unsatisfied. This a school-boy could not fail to stamp as the rankest absurdity. Prayer is either answered, or else those desires which impel man to come into communion with God are, of all the desires of his being, alone a mockery. Is any one credulous enough to believe that?

Any sound theory of prayer must also take into account another fact, namely, that of testimony. Men affirm that God has heard their prayers. From the number of witnesses let us exclude all those who might reasonably be accused of fanaticism; yet we have failed to see why the testimony

of a fanatical Christian is not just as trustworthy as that of a fanatical skeptic. We will exclude, too, all witnesses who may be reasonably suspected of having had collusion with each other. Then we will sift the testimony of the clear-headed, unbiased witnesses, striking out every statement which may, with the slightest show of reason, be considered as an illusion of honest but mistaken men. Even then, the remaining testimony, gathered from the witnesses of all time, all bearing on this one point, would, if printed in books, make a vast library. Can any just theory in reference to prayer omit a fact of such magnitude? Would it be scientific to ignore all this testimony of the purest and best men that ever lived? If their testimony is declared fanatical, would that not prove too much, if mere assertion ever proves anything? Would it not show that the fanaticism of the ages has contained within itself the godliness, the purity, the virtue of the ages? No, there is no way in which we can scientifically thrust such testimony out of sight. It stands as solid as granite, as clear as crystal, and he who would be scientific in handling the fact of prayer must take it up into his theory and account for it.

If it should be said that prayer and its supposed answer is simply a happy coincidence, we might grant that in one, or two, or three cases it may be, and do no despite to science. But take fifty cases, or five hundred, or ten thousand, and declare that in every case we have only a lucky coin-

cidence, so large a number of coincidences would tax our credulity far more than to admit that God in reality answered the prayers. Such a multitude of coincidences would be vastly more mysterious than the fact that thousands of men cried unto the Lord, and he, in mercy and love, heard their cries and satisfied their wants. By no device can we, with a strict scientific spirit and method, brush aside the vast mass of testimony that God has answered prayer.

Our argument in brief, then, is this: from any proper definition of science and prayer, we cannot discover anything within them that brings them into conflict. Those who rule out prayer for physical blessings on the ground of the immutability of natural laws must, if consistent, rule out prayer for spiritual blessings also, since law is as fixed in the realm of spirit as in the realm of matter. Confusion often results from a lack of precision in the use of the term law—a physical law being, to our observation, only a process in the material world; but as we see that in the process beneficent ends are reached, that fact suggests that the process may be simply God's method of acting. By these very processes, therefore, God may answer prayer. As men, by adjusting to each other the few immutable laws of the material world which they have laboriously learned, reach all the varied and marvelous results which we see produced by mechanical contrivances, so God, who works in and through all the laws of his universe, by their adjustment, without

in the slightest degree infringing them, may answer every prayer of his people. Any truly scientific theory of prayer must account for the fact of prayer, and deal dispassionately with the mass of testimony given, down through all the ages, that God has, in almost innumerable instances, answered prayer.

After a calm, dispassionate examination of all that has been written by materialistic scientists about the impotence and folly of prayer, we may, without the slightest danger of being unscientific, still believe and obey Him who, speaking with unerring wisdom, said, "Ask, and it shall be given you."

THE ATONEMENT THROUGH SYMPATHY

THE ATONEMENT THROUGH SYMPATHY

Walter Henry Pater, in his *Marius the Epicurean,** says, "The constituent practical difference between men" is "their capacity for sympathy." He who is able to apprehend most clearly the wretchedness of those in distress, to feel their sorrows most keenly, to go down to the lowest depths of their misery and suffer with them, is rightly esteemed the greatest. Whenever such a man appears, the multitude hails him as a hero.

Now, it is a matter of common observation that those who are purest and best most deeply sympathize with those in misery. To be sure some who have gone to great lengths in sin and crime are at times touched with pity, when they see their friends or neighbors suddenly overwhelmed in some dire calamity. But such cases are exceptional. One of the most awful effects of sin is to harden the heart, to blunt the moral sensibilities. It dries up the fountain of sympathy and tends to make men dead to the woes of others, while the spiritual renewal of men and their consequent fellowship with God in Christ gives them an ever enlarging capacity for sympathy. And the more Christlike they become the more broad and profound is their capacity to suffer with others.

* Vol. II, p. 203.

But Christ himself is absolutely perfect both in knowledge and in compassion. He not only apprehends all the miseries of our race, but through his sympathy and incarnation is identified with all who suffer. Not a sigh bursts from the lips of any one however obscure that he does not hear; not a tear stains any human cheek that he does not see; there is not a quivering nerve, nor a throbbing brain, nor an aching heart that does not stir the depths of his divine compassion. Since he is the God-man he bears on his infinite yet human heart the infirmities, the distresses, the manifold woes of the whole sinful human race.

Let us now note briefly some references in the Gospels to his wonderful sympathy. Again and again we are told that he was moved with compassion, or that he had compassion on those in distress. His miracles of healing were but the outflow of his sympathy. Seeing misery and being conscious that he had the power to alleviate it, his pity spontaneously expressed itself in healing disease, cleansing lepers, casting out demons, and at times in raising the dead, that he might thereby wipe away the tears of the bereaved. In the Gospels, we have specific accounts of scarcely a hundredth part of these miracles of mercy. The great mass of them are barely indicated by general statements, as in Mark 1: 32-34.

Later in his ministry, when in controversy with the Pharisees, Christ appealed to the signs wrought by him as a conclusive proof of his divine

mission, but he did not work them just to show that he was sent by God. They were but the natural expression of his tender sympathy with those in sharp distress. Being so understood, they become all the stronger evidence that Jesus was sent by his and our Father to be the Saviour of lost men.

But the religious condition of the multitudes, blighted by sin, and crushed under the burdens laid upon them by their professed teachers, specially broke up the fountain of his compassion, "because they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd."

At times his sympathy with those in trouble vented itself in tears. But Jesus was no weakling; he was the most manly of men. No one ever exceeded him in downright courage. In the teeth of adverse public opinion, he always calmly and resolutely said and did what he knew to be right. The threats of those in authority, clothed with all the power of government, never caused him to swerve a hair's breadth from the straight line of duty. When no one at Jerusalem cared or dared to cleanse the temple from mammon and restore it to spiritual service, he did it single-handed with a scourge of cords. When, standing under oath before the judges of the Sanhedrin, he knew that the confession of the truth as to who he was would nail him to a Roman cross, without the slightest evasion he made it. He not only answered the question put to him by the high priest, but lifted the curtain of the future that

his august questioner might catch a glimpse of his future glory, majesty and power. But his cheeks that never paled before the face of clay, at times, through sympathy for others, were wet with tears. "Jesus wept." When we consider who he was, these two words are the sublimest utterance of all literature. He came to Bethany, where lived three of his dearest friends, Mary, Martha and Lazarus. But four days before, Lazarus had died; still he claimed that he could wake him out of his sleep. So he went with the grief-stricken sisters towards their brother's tomb, and his sympathy with them was so profound that it expressed itself in trickling tears.

We turn from this touching domestic scene to an exhibition of Jesus' sympathy national in its scope. He was going up to Jerusalem for the last time. He came to the brow of Olivet. The city beyond the valley of the Kedron was in full view —the city that had so often rejected and stoned to death God's prophets, and now had rejected him, and was about to demand his crucifixion at the hands of the Gentiles. He, however, seemed quite oblivious to the crowning wrong and shame that he was so soon to suffer, and, without a thought of self, poured out the full tide of his sympathy on the doomed city. As he looked upon it, he could not suppress his tears.

His triumphal entry into it was just at hand. Already the rejoicing multitude was crying, "Hosanna to the son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the

highest." Already they were strowing palm-branches and their loose-flowing robes in his pathway; but his ear was deaf to their praises and glad shouts of welcome, and his eye was blind to the splendid pageant. While the multitude rejoiced, he wept. He cried, "If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace!" Jesus left that sentence unfinished; it ended in silent tears, more eloquent than words. After a little, recovering himself, he added; "But now they are hid from thine eyes."

To be sure, in his cry we catch the note of fervid, national patriotism. As a Jewish citizen, if nothing more, the impending destruction of Jerusalem well nigh broke his heart. His emotional utterance brings to mind the plaintive words of the Jewish captives in Babylon:

> "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,
> Let my right hand forget her skill.
> Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,
> If I remember thee not;
> If I prefer not Jerusalem
> Above my chief joy." (Ps. 137.)

But while the patriotic note is unmistakably heard in the cry of Jesus, it is but a sad undertone. The spiritual destruction of the people was the thought that pierced him through and through. This is clear from his cognate cry, twice repeated. Comparatively early in his ministry, when, according to Luke, he was going up to Jerusalem, some Pharisees warned him to get away, since Herod wished to kill him. But in spite of the bloody

threat, he determined to go on boldly with his work, saying that "it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." Then overwhelmed with the thought of the inevitable destruction of the city, he cried; "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto thee! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings, and ye would not." Here we see that it was the *spiritual* destruction of her "children" that stirred the deepest depths of his sympathy.

Once more the same cry burst from his lips. It was the last Passover week. Jesus was in Jerusalem. He delivered a remarkable address both to his disciples and to the Pharisees, unmasking the sins of the latter and appealing to his followers to avoid them. In this speech he pronounced upon the chief men of his nation seven woes so awful that they sound like seven thunders of divine judgment in the midst of his gospel of grace. But even these terrible words pulsated with his love. It was the last great effort of Christ to awaken the consciences of the Pharisees and win them to himself, so the thunder of his wrath ended in a divine sob, as he cried "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem." He stood within the walls of the sacred city when he uttered for the second time these words. It was the headquarters of those whom he addressed and denounced to their faces. "Verily," he said, "all these things shall come upon this generation," and "thy children" is

again the burden of his soul. That they should reject him, their Saviour, for whose coming they had so long looked and perish in their unbelief, broke his heart.

But his matchless sympathy was not hemmed in by state boundaries. A great apostolic writer says that "in the days of his flesh," he "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death." These words evidently portray the agony of Christ in Gethsemane. He had wept over Jerusalem, which was the life and heart of his nation; in the garden he now wept over a lost world. To save it he resigned himself to death, with all that that awful word signifies. His prayer, that he might be delivered from death, was answered in his complete submission to the divine will, which was the unmistakable undertone of every petition that he offered in Gethsemane, "not as I will, but as thou wilt."

Here, just before his death on the cross, we see how his overflowing sympathy encircled the globe, embracing all nations, kindreds and tongues. In the garden and on the cross the sin of our race pressed down on his heart like the superincumbent weight of a mountain. He sweat great drops of blood. He cried out, but it was the strong cry of perfect manhood. Tears coursed down his cheeks; they were the tears of the Son of God and of the Son of man, and they expressed the unbounded love of God for, and the unfathomable sympathy of God with, man.

But he himself has given a far more profound expression of his tender, brooding sympathy with all men than has fallen from the lips or flowed from the pen of any of his apostles. He was consciously near the close of his earthly life. Gethsemane lay just before him; a little beyond it was the cross. To his disciples he had more than once announced his death. They were bewildered and perplexed. Not apprehending the nature of his kingdom, his preannounced death seemed to them irretrievable disaster. He sat on the Mount of Olives. The disciples, filled with apprehension and fear, gathered around him. Full of pity for them, he tried to enlighten them, to tell them what his Kingdom was and what his going away from them meant. He took them beyond the dispensation which by his ministry had been ushered in to the time when he shall come in his glory to judge all men. He drew before them a picture of the general judgment, so clear, so simple, so sublime that it has entered into and shaped the thought of the whole Christian era in reference to the future state of the righteous and the wicked. And the crown of his matchless statement is the reply of the Judge to the humble righteous, who are unable to recall the good deeds that he declares they have done to him. "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me." He so completely identifies himself with them, that he who feeds one of them feeds him, he that clothes one of them clothes him, he who takes a homeless

one under his roof and cares for him, shelters and cares for Christ himself; he who honors one of his brethren honors him; he who neglects or despises one of them, even the least, neglects or despises him.

But how is such identification effected? how brought about? Not by extinguishing personality, not by monism, which teaches that the universe, man and God are one substance; which so obliterates personality as to destroy personal responsibility and accountability. For while all monists are not pantheists, all monism is pantheism. But the great Teacher, while identifying himself with his people, is still their Judge, and calls them to account for what they have, and have not done.

But what did Jesus mean by "my brethren"? what do these words include? None will doubt that Christ included in the phrase, "my brethren," his own followers. They bear his likeness, possess his spirit and by virtue of their regeneration or re-creation are his sons and daughters. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews probably had in mind the words of Jesus, on which we comment, when he wrote, "Both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he," in his glorified state, "is not ashamed," or delights, "to call them brethren." Other Scriptures tell us that believers are in Christ and Christ is in them; so that whatever is done to them is done to him. On this basis the glorified Saviour appealed to Saul of Tarsus, who

was cruelly maltreating some of the early disciples, "Saul, Saul, why persecute thou me?"

But did not Christ include in the phrase, "my brethren," more than his undoubted followers? did he not designate by it all men? Those that may differ on this point still agree on some fundamental facts. They alike hold that God made man in his own image, and that, on the ground of spiritual likeness, man was in the beginning God's child. But since man by sin lost his spiritual likeness to God and his fellowship with him, he imperatively needs to be created anew by the Spirit. By this re-creation the sinner is restored to right relation to God, to likeness to God, to fellowship with God, to the glad recognition that God is his Father and the joyful consciousness that he is God's child. On the basis of creation man is a child of God, by his re-creation in Christ Jesus he is brought to see this, and to act in conformity to it. Jesus taught Nicodemus that when he should be born from above by the Spirit he then could see the kingdom of God; so a sinner by a spiritual rebirth or re-creation comes to see or apprehend that God is his Father and that he is God's child. But whether he apprehends it or not the fact remains that by creation man was made God's child and Christ's brother. If this be true, then the words of Christ, "my brethren," include not only regenerated and saved souls but all men.

This conclusion is greatly strengthened by the fact that Jesus claimed to be both the Son of God

and the Son of man; identified with God on the one hand and with man on the other. In Matt. 25, when proclaiming the general judgment, he asserts that he, "the Son of man," is to be the judge of all men. When in conflict with the Pharisees, John 5, he made the same claim that he was to be the judge of all, and that his authority to execute judgment is based on the fact that "he is the Son of man." Having the nature of men, and being thereby identified with them, he is fitted to be their judge. It is in announcing his judgment of all men that he uses the phrase, "my brethren," making it strongly probable that he included in it every individual of our race.

If by "my brethren" the disciples of Christ are alone meant, then if a man has compassion on a heathen, or on one depraved and vile in a Christian land, and helps him when in distress, his act of mercy cannot be adjudged as done to Christ, although it may be an act of greater charity, of profounder self-abnegation than if it had been expended on a lovable Christian. It may have required the very highest possible expression of love,—love to an enemy. To limit Christ's words, "my brethren," to his followers would exclude the Good Samaritan from the blessing of having done his compassionate work to the Lord. Nor can we forget that Jesus himself was most deeply touched with the condition of the godless; his own countrymen, wandering from God without any true and competent teachers, aroused his deepest sympathy. It was *apostate* Jerusalem

that broke up the fountain of his tears; a lost world wrung out his heart's blood in Gethsemane; and did he by the phrase, "my brethren," exclude all, who, like him, weep over, and toil to save, the lost, from the ineffable blessing of being assured that they have done it unto him? Shall Judson's years of sympathetic toil, before even one idolater savingly received his message, be regarded as not done to Christ, while what he thereafter did to his *saved* brother must be so regarded? Is it not more reasonable to place in the category of Christ's brethren all that wear the human form, and conclude that he regards whatever good we may do to mortal man as done to him?

Growing out of this, how mighty is the motive to treat courteously, kindly, justly, yea more, to love, and to sympathize with, even the least, the most ignorant, the most depraved of our fellow men. Whatever we do to any one of them, we do to the eternal Lord of us all. How this matchless teaching of Jesus exalts man as such! How inconceivably sacred it reveals man's person to be!

Now, if we make no mistake, the fact so clearly taught in the Scriptures that Christ through his sympathy and incarnation is identified with our race, solves in a reasonable, natural way some of the profoundest facts connected with our redemption.

First, Christ's suffering, since he was sinless, has always been a baffling mystery. On the surface of things, so far as our observation and

experience extend, sin and suffering are always indissolubly yoked together. Where men are most intensely selfish and corrupt, where they most unconstrainedly indulge their bodily appetites and passions, and, regardless of the rights and happiness of others, seek their ambitious ends, there, other things being equal, is the greatest suffering. Where there is most of purity, the largest benevolence, where men most generally seek the highest good and greatest happiness of one another, there is the profoundest peace and the most exultant joy.

But while such general statements are unquestionably true, they make no distinction between physical and mental distress, between aching nerves and the anguish of the soul. There is, to say the least, bodily suffering where there is no sin. So far as we know, beasts do not and cannot sin, but they suffer physically. They fight and tear each other with tooth and claw, and devour each other. Men maim and slay them. Outside of their cruel internecine strifes, man inflicts upon them their greatest distresses. Nor is their suffering wholly physical; they also suffer through fear. Affrighted they flee at the approach of their enemies, whether they be stronger beasts or unpitying men. If they suffer in mind anything more than fear, we cannot ascertain it. At all events, apart from sin, here is suffering, whose metes and bounds we cannot very clearly discern.

Moreover, infants suffer. To be sure they are bound up with our sinful race. To them, by the

inexorable law of heredity, is imparted the taint of, and the tendency to, sin. But they have not voluntarily transgressed any law. And while they are unlike God, they are not responsible for it. They have no guilt, yet they suffer. Like animals they have both physical distress and fear, and sometimes grieve on account of neglect. Beyond this we cannot trace their suffering.

Frankly and fully taking into account these incontrovertible facts in reference to the suffering of sinless beasts and guiltless infants, we will now examine, as thoroughly as we can, the vast and difficult subject of the sufferings of the spotless Christ.

We first naturally turn to his temptations or trials arising from poverty, hunger, thirst and weariness, from the artfully seductive suggestions of the devil, from ambition, from unjust and cruel usage, and from the bitter taunts of his insolent foes. He was, says the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, "one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." (Heb. 4:15.) "For in that he himself hath *suffered* being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." (2:18.)

To these ordinary trials of Jesus, we must add the manifold woes and distresses of men, taken up by him through sympathy into his perfect mind and heart. While we, on account of the deadening by sin of our moral sensibilities, can, at the best but partially feel the miseries of others, he, the immaculate Christ, through sympathy felt

them in all their fulness and keenness. With this fact in mind let us reverently look in upon the mystery of Christ's agony in Gethsemane.

The first thing that arrests our attention is that his suffering was not physical, except so far as his body suffered through its vital connection with his mind. No hard hand of violence had yet been laid upon him. Toward midnight, he went to the garden or park with the eleven. As he entered it, he felt within his soul the mysterious, rising, surging tides of woe. When in great mental distress, men often desire to be alone, or with those with whom they are in closest intimacy. Jesus therefore said to his disciples, "Sit ye here, while I go yonder and pray." Already his distress was so acute that he felt that he could be relieved only by pouring his bursting heart into the infinite, compassionate heart of his Father. But also craving human sympathy, he chose three disciples, in whom he probably most confided, to go with him farther into the garden, where they might be beyond ear-shot of the rest. As they walked on these disciples saw, even in the moonlight, that the face of their Lord was clouded with inexpressible sadness, that his eyes betokened strange amazement, and that he was sorely troubled. He evidently marked their anxious solicitude for him and, in explanation of the woeful expression of his face, said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." Then longing for human sympathy on the one hand and for divine help on the other, he said to the three disciples, "Abide ye

here and watch with me;" then he "went forward a little," and falling on his face, prayed, "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." He thus poured out his soul three times, returning, at the close of both the first and second agonizing petitions to the three disciples, to whom he appealed for sympathy. His agony of spirit was unprecedented, marvelous, matchless. His body betokened it. As he prayed, Luke says, "his sweat became as it were great drops of blood, falling down upon the ground."

How can we account for such excruciating suffering of soul in the spotless Son of God? Some have taken the superficial ground that he shrank with unutterable horror from death on a Roman cross; that in view of it he agonized in prayer, shed bitter tears and sweat blood. There is not, however, a scintilla of evidence in the Gospels that he ever feared mere physical death. Such a view makes a coward of him, makes him in sturdy manhood less than hosts even of his weakest disciples, who, out of fidelity to him, have endured deaths more painful than that of the cross, without complaint or even a tremor, yea more, sometimes with songs of triumph on their lips. Such a baseless, unworthy view of our Lord need not further detain us.

Moreover, in explanation of Jesus' agony in the garden conscience is of course excluded. When, with an unclouded mind, a wicked man approaches death, his past life, deeply stained by sin, stands

vividly before him. Conscience wakes from its torpor and stings him; remorse bites him. He begins to feel the gnawings of the worm that dies not, the withering touch of the unquenchable fire. But Jesus was sinless. He never prayed for forgiveness, because he did not need it. He claimed that he always did what pleased the Father. He had no regret for any thought that he had ever cherished, for any word that he had ever spoken, nor for any deed that he had ever done. He looked back over a life of wonderful beneficence. He had opened blind eyes, unstopped deaf ears, loosed dumb tongues, straightened crippled limbs, cleansed loathed lepers, cast out demons, raised the dead, dried the tears of mourners, and preached to the neglected and despised poor the good news of God's love to all men, even to the meanest of them. Yet, while knowing his absolute integrity, and having the unmistakable approval of his conscience and of his Father, his suffering in Gethsemane was so great, that no finite intellect can fathom it. The only possible solution of it, it seems to me, is found in Christ's identification with our race. His sympathy with us was so profound and so absolutely perfect that he felt our sharpest distresses as though they were his own. The culmination of his suffering in Gethsemane was death. He said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." But what did he mean by death?

In whatever order of being death occurs, we find that it is a separation. When a plant dies,

what we call its life, known only by its manifestation, is separated from the root, stalk and leaf, which consequently wither and decay. When an animal dies life is separated from its flesh, blood and bones, which then soon crumble to dust. In the same way man as animal dies; but he is both material and spiritual, has both body and soul; is linked on the one hand to the beasts that perish, and on the other hand to God. As spirit he is made to live in fellowship with God. But when he sins his union with God ceases. He is separated from him, and that separation is spiritual death, death in its essence; and that death is the penalty of sin. When, therefore, Christ declared that he was sorrowful even unto death, he spoke of spiritual death, sorrowful even unto separation from God; sorrowful because through his divine sympathy he began to feel the awfulness of that separation; began to know by experience the fearful misery of the transgressor, suffering the penalty due to sin. Back from such an experience he shrank with "strong crying and tears," and in inconceivable agony prayed that that cup, if it were possible, might pass away from him.

But Gethsemane and the cross are halves of one sphere. Christ's experience in the garden reaches its climax on Calvary. In the one we have his sorrow even unto death, unto separation from God, on the other his appalling cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Did God forsake him? He never forsakes any soul that

sincerely seeks him, however imperfect and unworthy that soul may be. Much less did he forsake his only begotten Son, who was one with him and always perfectly did his will. How then shall we interpret this amazing, despairing cry of Christ?

He was our elder brother; he had our nature and our experiences, yet without sin. And he had also entered into a profounder and more intimate union with mankind than most Christian thinkers of the ages have ever seemed to conceive. His sympathy with men, lost in sin, was perfect. His heart was the infinite heart of God. He was capable of taking up into it all the woes of our sinful race. And in his unbounded compassion he did not fail to enter fully into the awful experience of those, made to live in fellowship with God, who yet were separated from him by their transgressions. Through his divine sympathy with them, he felt within his own soul all their woe. And when on his cross he cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" we hear in those awful words the wail of a lost race.

Now, the only possible sense in which the sinless Christ could bear the sins of men is that he voluntarily bore the penalty justly due to sin. And this penalty was not laid upon him from without. We have no evidence of any mechanical arrangement between the persons of the triune God, that one should mete out the penalty of sin, and that another, called the second person of the Trinity, should receive it. On the contrary, in

the most natural manner, as the spontaneous outflow of his love for men and of his identifying sympathy with them, he fully felt in himself, on their behalf, the awful reality of their spiritual death.

This view furnishes the most reasonable explanation of the atonement. Christ, by his sympathetic suffering, revealed, as he could have done in no other way, the depth and tenderness of the divine love for sinful men. On the other hand, his soul-suffering even unto death, flowing from his perfect sympathy with lost men, proclaims in tones clear and terrible the awfulness and ineffable hatefulness of sin. It cost the sympathetic, sinless Son of God the pangs of spiritual death. All the hollow depths of hell seem to resound in Christ's appalling cry on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Separation from God—all that there is, or can be, in perdition is wrapped up in that. Forsaken of God—hell is only that "writ large." And that is the bitter fruit of sin.

The intensity of Christ's suffering for us through sympathy is confirmed by modern scientific investigation, which has shown that Christ probably died not from the tortures of the cross but from the violence of emotion, that literally ruptured the walls of his heart and filled the pericardium with blood. This theory alone explains the extravasated blood, separated into red clot and watery serum, that poured from his side when pierced with a spear. Moreover this is consonant

with the suddenness of his death, which at the time puzzled and amazed the Roman authorities. Those crucified usually lived from twelve hours to two or three days, but Christ died in six hours. And when death came he was still physically strong, as is shown by his loud cry just before he bowed his head and gave up the ghost. He died not from pain of body, but from anguish of spirit. Through sympathy he took the agony of a sinful world up into his soul. In the language of prophecy he could say, "The reproaches of them that reproach thee are fallen on me," "Reproach hath broken my heart." (Ps. 69:9, 20.) (See Dr. Stroud's treatise, "On the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ," also Hanna's "The Life of our Lord." V. p. 323 and Appendix.)

It may be objected that this view of Christ's atonement robs it of one of its essential elements; that the Scriptures represent him as suffering for us or on our behalf; that one may suffer sympathetically *with* another without suffering *for* him. True, the Bible does clearly teach that Christ suffered *for* us, yea more, that he suffered vicariously for us. But cannot one at the same time suffer both with and for another? If one suffers with another in distress, does not that fact cheer and help him who is in distress? Does not suffering *with* another naturally culminate in suffering *for* another?

A few years ago, a man strolling along the shore of Lake Michigan, at Jackson Park, Chicago, went into the lake for a bath. He soon began to strug-

gle in the water and lustily called for help. A crowd hurriedly gathered on the beach, but no one dared to go into those treacherous waters. The man sank, but just as he rose again to the surface, a student of the university came on the run to the rescue. He quickly flung away hat, coat and shoes, and boldly plunging in, swam straight to the drowning stranger. The large company on the shore was as still as a stone. The anxiety was intense lest the man now frantically struggling for his life should instinctively grasp his would-be deliverer and both should go down to death beneath the waves. But the student cautiously kept the half-drowned man at arm's length, and slowly brought him on toward the shore. The moment that the rescuer and the rescued stood upright in shallow water, the crowd that had waited seemingly an age in breathless silence, broke out into glad huzzas that made the welkin ring, and in their joyful excitement threw their caps, hats and coats high up into the air. Why? They had simply witnessed an act of vicarious suffering. One man had sympathized with another, whose life was in imminent peril, and out of sympathy for him had exposed himself to the same peril. His sympathy *with* him expressed itself in an heroic deed *for* him. He voluntarily thrust himself into the jaws of death that he might snatch his fellow man from them.

A man on a certain Board of Trade was downcast and almost in despair because he could not meet his note of $25,000 in the bank, which must

be paid by two o'clock in the afternoon or his credit would be utterly destroyed. A member of the Board, whose business standing was flawless, deeply sympathizing with his brother trader, lifted the burden off from him by putting his name upon the despairing man's paper. He took his place, suffered in his stead, paid his debt, and saved him from financial ruin. Here again sympathizing with led to doing for.

It is always so, where sympathy is genuine. Jesus in his peerless parable says, that the Samaritan, when he came to the unfortunate Jew, who had been robbed, stripped and beaten into insensibility, had compassion on him, sympathized with him, and that sympathy at once expressed itself in outward and helpful act on behalf of the sufferer. So the Chief of good Samaritans sympathized, suffered with us, who had been robbed and deeply wounded by sin, and his divine sympathy so identified him with us that he felt within himself in all its dread reality the penalty justly due to our sin. He sympathized *with* us and hence died *for* us.

But the notion that God ever suffers, some scholarly thinkers reject with apparent horror. In their view suffering is an attribute of imperfection, is either an accompaniment of immaturity, like the growing pains of children, or the direct effect of personal sin, and so cannot be predicated of God.

Of course God is neither immature nor sinful, nor does he suffer from such causes. But the suf-

fering that we attribute to him, flows from his absolute perfection; suffering that is the inevitable concomitant of his unspeakable love for, and boundless sympathy with, those that are in distress. That God must thus suffer we infer from the universal experience and observation of men. One who can look without pity and pain on the sufferings of others, is always unhesitatingly pronounced heartless. Is God as unfeeling as the worst of our race? Those who feel most acutely the manifold miseries of men and hasten to alleviate them, are universally regarded as the very noblest of the earth. Suffering that arises from our sympathy with those in distress is not a proof of imperfection of character, but rather of character reaching up toward that of God himself. In Christ, in whom was the Godhead bodily, we have the highest known example of sympathetic suffering, and his suffering instead of proving him imperfect, exalted him to the throne of the universe. Having, through sympathy with lost men, suffered, on their behalf, the pangs of spiritual death, "God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name." (Phil. 2:9.)

But some, who emphatically affirm that suffering is utterly incompatible with any true conception of God, still hold to the deity of Christ, and admit of course, as every intelligent Christian man must, that he suffered and suffered for us. But to steer clear of the notion of a suffering God, they fall back on the two natures of Christ, the

divine and the human. To Christ's human nature they ascribe his suffering, while the divine nature, without the slightest touch of pain or compassion, holds up the human so that it can drink the cup of woe to the dregs and perfect the work of atonement for the sinner. All this is well and devoutly meant, and should be so considered. But in all that Christ said and did, as it is reported in the New Testament, we have no hint that the human and divine natures in him acted thus separately and independently. There is no evidence that he had two consciousnesses, the human and the divine. According to the evangelists the one indivisible Christ acted, said this and that, did this and that. Moreover, the apostles, who, guided by the Spirit, still further unfolded and interpreted the gospel for us, do not sever the personality of Christ so that the human and divine in him stand over against each other. That both the Gospels and Epistles teach the undivided personality of Jesus is sustained by the ripest modern scholarship.

That God, through sympathy with his people, suffers, is strongly re-enforced by many declarations of the Old Testament, scattered from Genesis to Zechariah. When, before the flood, the race became very corrupt, it "grieved" Jehovah "at his heart." (Gen. 6:6.) He saw the affliction of his people in Egypt, heard their cry, knew their sorrows and came down to deliver them. (Ex. 3:7-8.) In the time of the Judges, Jehovah's "soul was grieved for the misery of Israel." (Judges

10:16.) In Isaiah (63:9) it is declared that Jehovah "was afflicted in all his people's affliction." Jehovah's cry over Ephraim, through the lips of Hosea (11:8), ending in the words, "My heart is turned within me, my compassions are kindled together," shows how deeply his soul was pained on account of Israel's incorrigible rebellion against him. And we learn from Zechariah that the Lord was identified with his ancient people, "He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his," Jehovah's "eye." (Zech. 2:8.) No wonder that George Adam Smith in his exposition of Isaiah devotes an entire chapter to "The Passion of God."

But some say these are merely anthropomorphisms. Most of the representations of God in the Bible are. "Our Father, who art in heaven" is one; "The Lord is my shepherd" is another; but the real question is What do these anthropomorphisms mean? What do they tell us about God? Do they misrepresent him? If Christ does not misrepresent him then they do not. The same Jehovah that cried over his people in Babylon through the lips of his prophet,

> "Like a woman in travail I gasp,
> Pant and palpitate together,"
> (Smith's Isaiah, Vol. II, p. 134)

wept over Jerusalem, and agonized over a world in Gethsemane.

And the crowning consideration on this point is that no man, during all the ages, ever longed

for an unsympathetic, passionless God. From such an unfeeling God, men universally recoil. Being infinite in holiness and power they tremble in his presence, but cannot love him. With tricky, sinful Jacob they cry, "Jehovah is in this place." "How dreadful is this place!" A God who fills men with cowering fear and shuddering dread, who cannot sympathize or suffer with them in their deep distress, even though their woes are but the just retribution for their sins, cannot be the true God. Although some men under the old dispensation caught clear glimpses of Jehovah and of his love and sympathy, not till Christ came did "the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in its wings." (Mal. 4:2.) "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life," is the sweetest song ever heard on earth. The loving, sympathetic God, the true God, was in Christ. What Christ did, he did. What Christ suffered, he suffered. Christ, God in Christ, took up into his heart of infinite tenderness all our sorrows, and felt them with us even unto death. To him men, even when half awake to spiritual realities, are irresistibly drawn.

During Christ's earthly ministry, Luke tells us (15:1) that publicans and sinners kept coming to him to hear him. They knew that he abhorred their sins, but in spite of that they were attracted to his person and loved to hear his words. They did not know that he was God in their own flesh,

but they felt that they stood in the presence of one who understood them and whose sympathy overflowed to them; so in spite of the protests of the Pharisees, the acknowledged leaders of the people, they kept coming to Jesus. Neither their sins nor their rulers could keep them away from him. The true, sympathetic God allures and satisfies men. The supreme need of the world is to know him.

But can a suffering Saviour be happy? men ask. Pain or suffering is not in itself an evil but a beneficent agent for the good of men. It is often a kindly warning against sinful excesses, which, if persisted in, bring men prematurely to death. It is also a moral discipline by which men are unfolded into virtue. In suffering one learns how to let patience have her perfect work, that he may reach that state of perfection in which he shall lack nothing. Even Christ learned by suffering how to be our "merciful and faithful high priest." It is also an expression of our heavenly Father's love, and when endured with resignation to the divine will brings forth in us "the fruit of righteousness." To begin at the lowest point, physical suffering and happiness are not incompatible. Christian invalids, along whose quivering nerves pain runs with blistering feet, often have deep down in their hearts the peace of God that passes all understanding. The peace and even joy of the martyrs, when enduring the most excruciating physical tortures, have been not only unruffled but enhanced. Moreover, even mental suffering has

been unable to drive happiness from the soul that unwaveringly trusts in God. Innumerable times Christian men, smarting under baseless slander,

> "Whose edge is sharper than the sword, whose tongue
> Outvenoms all the worms of Nile,"
>
> (Cymbeline III, Sc. 4.)

have still been serene and happy. Now the most exquisite of all suffering is that which flows from our sympathy with those in distress, and such sufferers, by common consent, are the happiest of mortals. And if this be true in the case of imperfect men, it is also unquestionably true in the case of God. Our divine Lord who suffers sympathetically with us is at the same time filled with unfathomable peace and happiness unalloyed.

These objections answered, this then is the sum of our contention: Christ, on account of what he is and did, made it possible for every man to be reconciled to God. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." Through his infinite love, boundless sympathy and incarnation he identified himself with our race; took up into himself all our distresses and felt in all its fulness and sharpness our chief woe, separation from God on account of our voluntary transgression. The sinless Saviour thus endured with us and for us death, the penalty of sin, bore it in his own body on the tree, satisfied in himself every demand of his own law on the sinner, and exhibited, as he could have done in no other way, the limitless love of God to sinful men, and the awfulness and un-

speakable hatefulness of sin. And all this—and here is the emphasis—as the natural, spontaneous outflow of his love for us and his unfathomable, tender sympathy with us.

THE FUNDAMENTAL MORAL ATTRIBUTE OF GOD

THE FUNDAMENTAL MORAL ATTRIBUTE OF GOD

To make my discussion as clear as possible, I wish to notice at the start that by "fundamental" I do not mean that one attribute of God is any more necessary to his perfection than another. If we should strip him of any one of his attributes, he would no longer be God. The word "fundamental" refers solely to our logical conception of God's moral attributes. By any just analysis of those attributes, which one in our thinking underlies all the rest? Out from which one must all the other of his moral attributes spring, so that we cannot conceive of their existence apart from it?

I trust that I am fully aware of the difficulty and profundity of this subject. I fear that it may be possible for those who may read this chapter truthfully to say to me, "you have nothing to draw with and the well is deep." I certainly hardly expect, in a brief essay, to clear the ground of deeply-rooted theological doctrine; but I wish with becoming modesty, so far as I can attain to that grace, to present tentatively a view which at least satisfies me better than the diverse views hitherto held on this subject by great and justly honored theologians.

Some of them have made holiness the fundamental attribute of God, and by convincing logic

have shown how all the rest of his moral attributes flow out of it, or are based upon it, and are controlled and modified by it. Others have contended that love is the fundamental attribute and that holiness is only an essential quality of love; God's love is a holy love. But one instinctively feels that this reasoning is somewhat strained; and a suspicion creeps into the mind that it is resorted to to bolster up a preconceived theory. Some theologians of our time have for years vigorously maintained that holiness is the fundamental attribute of God, and then have shifted their position, abandoning all their cogent arguments, and have contended with new-born zeal that love is the fundamental attribute. And this swinging from one extremity of the arc to the other, they have heralded as progress. But it is barely possible that neither view is right, and that lying back of holiness and love there is an attribute which is fundamental to both of them. And we venture to suggest that that attribute is life.

We do not mean by life simply being, existence, continuity of existence, but a distinctive spiritual life, a life that inevitably blossoms into holiness and love. Without this life God might have being, intellectuality, will, but without it he could have neither holiness, nor love, nor any other moral attribute. This I trust will be made reasonably clear at a later stage of our argument.

In order that we may see that life, as we have defined it, is a moral attribute, we must distinguish the different classes of God's attributes.

First, there are attributes which belong simply to the being of God—are simply inherent in being as such; sometimes unhappily they have been called the mechanical attributes; these are God's eternalness, omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence. We can conceive of these attributes entirely apart from any moral quality. In other words there might be eternalness, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence not only not moral, but all save the first malignant. Happily we know from the revelation of God to us that the everywhere-present One is holy, that holy eyes see all things, and that his omnipotence is wielded in behalf of righteousness,—but these attributes which pertain simply to his being are not necessarily moral.

Whereas, his life,—his distinctively spiritual life, life distinguished from mere being, from intellect, from will,—and also holiness, and love, which, we think, are based upon it, are moral attributes; and our inquiry is which of these moral attributes is fundamental?

We need to make one more classification. There are some attributes that are passive, and some that are active. This discrimination must be made even among the attributes which belong simply to God's being as such. Omnipresence is clearly a passive attribute, while omniscience is necessarily active. To see requires attention, and attention presupposes the action of the will. While omnipotence, from different points of view, is both passive and active. Potential omnipo-

tence, or omnipotence viewed simply as a possession, is passive; omnipotence wielded is of course active.

Now the moral attributes of God are divided into the same classes. Life, as we have defined it, partakes of both the passive and active. Passively it indicates a state or condition; but life always struggles to express itself; and the spiritual life of God expresses itself in holiness, love, mercy, etc. The passive unfolds itself, and so far it is an active attribute. Holiness also on one side is passive; but it too expresses itself in love and justice. But love, justice, and mercy are among the active moral attributes.

We have now sufficiently defined and differentiated the attribute which we think is the fundamental, moral attribute of God. Talking with a learned friend, he raised the question as to whether life is an attribute of God at all. But an attribute of any object is one of its *essential* qualities. All the essential qualities of an object, so far as we can apprehend them, put into a declaration concerning that object, or affirmed of it, constitute a definition of it. Any attempted definition of God that should leave out his distinctive moral or spiritual life would be so manifestly defective that a tyro in theology would reject it. It is then an attribute, an essential quality of God as God is revealed to us; it is a moral attribute; it is fundamental to all other moral attributes,—without it they could not be; the existence of each one of them implies its existence.

From the life of God as now defined his other moral attributes are naturally and readily deduced. Not to stop to test this statement in reference to them all, let us test it in reference to holiness and love. As to holiness, the life of which we speak is characterized by it. To divest the spiritual life of God of holiness would divest it of one of its essential qualities. The spiritual life of God apart from holiness is unthinkable. Still holiness is only an essential quality of it. We do not naturally say live holiness, but a holy life. Holiness is the expression of the innermost nature of this life.

But God's spiritual, holy life also expresses itself in love. But in our thought we must differentiate love from emotion. Emotion accompanies love, but it is not love itself. Love in its last analysis is choice or preference. Since God's life is holy he is impelled by his moral nature to choose, to prefer, to love that which is holy. So among all the objects of his creation on this earth he prefers, loves men. He loves them because they are made in his own image. That image has been marred and defaced by sin; still God sees that it may be perfectly retraced in the souls of men, and restored to its pristine purity; on that account he so loved men that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. He prefers, loves, men above trees or beasts since he sees the possibility of their becoming as pure as he himself is pure. But the same holy life that

leads him to prefer, to love men because made in his image and capable of becoming in moral purity like himself, leads him also to loath and hate sin by which his image has been polluted and defaced. Love, preference for that which is good, and hatred for that which is evil have the same root; they both spring from the same holy life of God. His holy life also impels him to love his children with a special love, to prefer them to those who are not his children by virtue of the new birth by his Spirit. It leads him to prefer the angels, those seraphic spirits that have never sinned, to devils; it leads him to prefer, love, his own immaculate character, his stainless glory above all. There is in this no selfishness; having a holy life as the fundamental moral attribute of his being, he is under a moral necessity of preferring, loving that which is supremely perfect. And this explains why he made his own glory his supreme end in creation. An aged disciple, in a cottage of Northern England, said 'It *sets* him well to commend himself'; it sets, it becomes him well to commend himself. He loves, prefers himself; he cannot do otherwise since he is the absolute standard of holiness in the whole universe.

Now having noted that holiness and love both flow from the spiritual life of God, let us see what the Scriptures suggest as to his fundamental moral attribute.

We turn to the Old Testament and find in several passages that God is distinctively called the "living God." He was thus at times contrasted

with idols that were declared to be dead. (Josh. 3:10; 2 Kings 19:4, 16; cf. 1 Thess. 1:9.) But the contrast was made by that essential attribute which preeminently distinguished him from insensate, inert idols. The loving God; the holy God would have connoted a striking contrast; but the living God connoted a contrast still more radical and striking.

Full forty times we have record of oaths reverently made by men all along the entire period of the development of Israel's history, and in every instance the oath is by God or Jehovah that *liveth.* But his love, mercy, longsuffering, forgiveness, holiness had all been revealed; but no recorded oath takes up into its expression one of those attributes, but it does take up into itself the attribute of life and that only. Naturally that which was fundamental in the character of God would find expression in the solemn, reverent oath.

Moreover, at least nine times we have the record of the oath by which God, Jehovah, swore by himself; and in no instance did he swear by his holiness or his love, but always by his life; "As I live" is the expression in every case. When he thus took his oath, a recent authority says that he evidently swore by the inmost moral attribute of his being.

But in the ever-unfolding revelation of God, Christ at last, in the fulness of time, came; Christ who was in the beginning, in eternity, with God and was God; Christ, who is the brightness of the

Father's glory, and the express image of his person; Christ in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. In him we can learn more of what God is than from all other sources. And the disciple that leaned on Jesus' bosom, and looked down deeper into the depths of his divine nature than any other follower of his, says "in him was life, and the life was the light of men." Neither the Master, nor any of his disciples, can give light to others unless he first has life, and no life gives light except a holy life. To my own mind, in such a characterization of his Lord, John seized upon the fundamental moral attribute of his being, and that attribute in him, who is the express image of God the Father, is life.

This representation made by the disciple whom Jesus loved, is sustained by the words of Jesus himself. Among the reasons that he gave why "all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father," we find this: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." He did not say love, or holiness but *life*. What of homage is due to the Father is due also to the Son because he has in himself the very life of the Father. Was he not here speaking of the innermost attribute both of the Father and of himself? In such a connection, where he mentions only one attribute of the Father and himself would he have mentioned any attribute but the fundamental one? And just before Gethsemane and the cross, he said to his

sorrowing and bewildered disciples, as they were asking after the way to the Father, I am the way to him; I am the truth and reveal to you the fact that you can have fellowship with him through me; and I am the life; the very life of God is mine; I will impart it to you. Jesus had before said that he quickened, made alive, whom he would. And when one possesses that life, he will be in spiritual life one with Christ and the Father. In this wonderfully pregnant declaration, "I am the way, the truth and the life," "the life" is the climax. He in whom we can see as nowhere else what God is, announces himself as "the life"; that is the utmost height of his claim.

Now let us test the truth of our position, that life is the fundamental attribute of God, by what is wrought in those that are saved. The New Testament represents men in their impenitent state as dead. But at the same time they are alive. "She that liveth in pleasure," says Paul, " is dead while she liveth." Impenitent men are physically alive; in this respect they are like the beasts of the field; they are also intellectually alive; capable of originating and executing great business enterprises; of wisely solving the profoundest problems of statesmanship; of pushing out into new fields of scientific research; of producing literature that shall live on through many generations, stirring, delighting, benefiting all who read it; but at the same time they are spiritually dead. At the same time they are both like and unlike God. Like God they have reason;

like God they have will; but unlike God they have no spiritual, holy life. They are dead in just that attribute that corresponds to the innermost moral attribute of God. That in which they differ from God is so transcendently more vital and important than that in which they are like God, that they have no fellowship with him. Reason and will may be exercised quite outside of that which is moral or spiritual, and in the case of impenitent men are so exercised; so that though they reason and will they are dead to God; in them there is no response to the spiritual life of God; they are dead to his fundamental moral attribute.

Now, only life can impart life. Spontaneous generation mooted by Tyndal at Belfast years ago was proved to be unscientific. The German scientists tested it by experimentation. They took matter, killed every germ of life in it, and then put it in the best possible conditions for spontaneously producing life. But the only response was death; and the whole scientific world abandoned the theory of spontaneous generation as utterly untenable. As it is in the physical universe so is it in the spiritual. Men spiritually dead cannot give to themselves spiritual life. Wherever and whenever they have tried it, the only response to their efforts has been death. He, the innermost moral attribute of whose being is life, only can impart life. He comes to us in Jesus Christ, who said, "I came that they may have *life,* and may have it abundantly," or, as in the margin of the R. V., may "have abundance"

of life. Here we have the primary object for which Christ came; primarily not to give holiness or love, but to give *life*. He pours into the very part of man's being where death reigns his life, and brings man into fellowship with him, whose fundamental moral attribute is life.

We must notice also that the imparting of life is in the Scriptures connected with faith. Christ said, "He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into *life.*" But belief, trust unites him who exercises it with God; brings him into vital fellowship with God, so that the holy life of God flows over into him. Not primarily the holiness or love of God is imparted to him, but a holy life. So John says, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life." Not primarily holiness or love, but life and that eternal. Christ said to the Pharisees, "Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life." Jesus called himself the bread of life, and declared that "The bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven and giveth life unto the world." At the close of his gospel John said, referring to what he had recorded, "These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name." But we need not multiply passages of similar import. It is abundantly clear from these that God in Christ came primarily to impart *life* to men, and that in the impartation of it men themselves must cooperate with God,

must trust in him, vitally connect themselves with him by faith. That which God imparts is manifestly primary, not secondary.

This view of life reveals to us what the Scriptures mean by "eternal life." Here are some passages that contain this phrase. Matt. 25:46. The righteous shall go away into eternal life. Mk. 10:17, 30, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? Receive in the world to come eternal life. Jno. 3:15, That whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life. 4:36, He that reapeth receiveth wages and gathereth fruit unto life eternal. 6:54, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life. 10:28, I give unto them (my sheep) eternal life. 17:2, To them he should give eternal life. Rom. 2:7, God gives "to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life." 6:23, But the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord. 1 Tim. 6:12, Lay hold on life eternal. These are only a few Scriptures among many in which the phrase is used. A phrase so constantly recurring should be as clearly as possible understood. In these passages eternal life is represented as a gift of God bestowed through faith, as the reward of obedience, and is an unending, unchangeable inheritance.

It is obvious at a glance that the phrase "eternal life" does not mean simply immortality, continuous, unending existence. Immortality is not bestowed upon men through their faith in God;

is not something that we can lay hold of. It belongs to man's original constitution. By no act of his is it either secured or lost. It is an original, essential attribute of man as such. Just as the attribute of eternalness belongs to the simple being of God, and has in itself no moral quality, so the attribute of immortality belongs to the original nature of man and possesses in itself no moral quality whatsoever. By virtue of it man continues to exist forever in weal or woe. But eternal life is something secured by man; something granted to him by God in Christ. It is to our mind evidently the holy life of God, once possessed by man, made in God's image, but lost by sin, but now restored to him by God in Christ through faith. The loss of it entailed upon our race untold misery; the restoration of it to all who will receive it, brings to them blessing, happiness, joy greater than any words can express; makes them one with God in his fundamental moral attribute. His holy life becomes theirs; the peace of God that passes all understanding becomes their unfailing, their eternal possession. All the ineffable joys and glories of heaven flow forth from it.

Paul, the great apostolic interpreter of the gospel, is in entire harmony with Jesus and John in reference to the fact that life is fundamental in the character of the believer. To be sure he deals more constantly with righteousness, an inevitable expression of the life; but a passage in Galatians makes the impartation of life the

basal fact in the salvation of a sinner. In that passage the Apostle says, "For if there had been a law given which could make alive;" now we expect him to say, making alive, or the impartation of life, "would have been of the law." But no, in the second, the conditional member of his sentence, he uses the term righteousness, which designates the expression or counterpart of life. Nor does he leave us in doubt as to what he regards as the source of the life; while it is not the law that makes alive, the law is the pedagogue that leads men to Christ who can and will make them alive. In the same epistle, before he thus elaborates this thought, he speaks of his own, personal salvation, as wrapped up in the life of Christ. By faith he is so identified with Christ that on the one hand he is crucified with him, but on the other (blessed paradox) he lives as never before; but so perfectly is he identified with his Saviour, that his life is Christ living in him. He does not give even a hint in reference to holiness or love, but the foundation fact in his salvation is life; the very life of Christ is so imparted to him that he in Christ and Christ in him live the same life. We need not multiply passages from Paul's epistles; but when we catch his idea of Christ's life in the believer we do not wonder that he directs Timothy to charge those "that are rich in this present world" to "lay hold rather on the life which is life indeed;" because that life is eternal salvation enfolding within itself every conceivable excellence and glory; nor do we won-

der that he wrote to the Colossians, "when Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory."

But to this view it is objected that John wrote in his first epistle those wonderful words of light and power, "God is love;" some, therefore, have declared that love is the very substance of God. But no one knows what is the substance of the human soul, nor even what is the substance of matter, and so certainly no one knows what is the substance of God. And if John's words should be taken as the revelation to us of God's substance, that contention would lead us into difficulty, since in the same epistle the beloved disciple declares that "God is light." In this declaration do we have the revelation that light is the substance of God? Or are light and love identical? Is it not John's way of expressing with weightiest emphasis a vastly important attribute of God? And perhaps when men say that love is the very substance of God, they are simply giving expression to their high appreciation of his love by words of intense rhetoric.

Now, to complete the presentation of our view we must not fail to note the corresponding attributes of the believer and God. When spiritual life is imparted to one who is brought by faith into touch with Christ, his moral state becomes like that of God himself. He has holiness within him now, at least in germ. His holiness manifests itself in righteousness, which is right acting both toward God and men; it manifests itself in jus-

tice which meets the full measure of obligation not only to individuals with whom we are bound up together in society, but also to society and the State; it leads him to do both his individual and corporate duties.

As the outgrowth of his new life he has love like that of God; it is the same in kind, but of course falls short of it in degree. He now loves, chooses, prefers what God loves, chooses, prefers. Just as God loves, prefers, his own stainless holiness, so does the believer prefer God's holiness, and begins to strive after it. Just as God loves, especially prefers, his children to all other men, so the believer begins to love, to prefer them. We know that we have passed out of death into life because we love, prefer, the brethren. Just as God loves, prefers, impenitent men above all other living creatures on the earth, save his own children, because they are made in his own image, and have full provision made for their salvation in the death and life of his Son, so the believer, who has passed out of death into life, the very life of God, according to his measure and capacity, also loves, prefers, them. Paul, as soon as he became conscious of his new life in Christ, preached Jesus to his Jewish brethren at Damascus that he might save them. He at once began to love as God loves, and to hate as God hates. And he is but a type of all into whom through faith God's life flows. Each one can sing with Wesley,

"Jesus all the day long
Was my joy and my song:"

but from every such soul, rejoicing on account of his new life, there inevitably bursts forth the next line,

"O that all his salvation might see!"

Now, we know that we get our conception of God's attributes from what we observe in ourselves, who are made in the image of God. There is within each one of us a sense of justice; of this we are conscious; a like sense of justice we rightly attribute to God; only in us this sense of justice is finite, in God it is infinite; renewed men love God and their brethren; so they conclude that love is a moral attribute of God; only while they love imperfectly and finitely, he loves perfectly and infinitely. And so of all the other moral attributes. Now we know beyond the shadow of a doubt that in us spiritual life is fundamental to holiness and love. No man can have holiness and love until the moral life of God is imparted to him. And as this is so in us, it is also so in God. Back of and beneath his attributes of holiness and love lies his moral life; and out of it holiness and love spring.

If our position be true, then those theological writers, who contend with each other as to whether holiness or love is the fundamental moral attribute of God, might be brought into blissful unity by a cordial recognition of the moral life of God as his fundamental attribute, the natural, inevitable expression of which is holiness and love, and without which neither holiness nor love could possibly exist.

Moreover, a common declaration of our day is "Christianity is not a system of doctrine, but a life." This popular affirmation is of course too sweeping; loosely speaking, Christianity is not merely a system of doctrine, but is also a life. That would be nearer the truth. But the life is the all-important thing. Doctrine that does not under God produce life, is more worthless than a dead tree; you can make fire-wood of that, but dead doctrine, dry as it is, you cannot even burn. Now if our contention be true, we find in the innermost nature of the divine Being the real foundation for the popular cry, "Christianity is a life." It is so because men dead in sin have through grace poured into them the holy life of God, and they become first of all one with him in the fundamental attribute of his being.

This truth, for which we here contend, has also vital connection with our preaching. Many of those to whom we speak are spiritually dead. There is no salvation for them unless they are brought by us, not only face to face with God, but into touch with him who has life in himself. Men touch God by faith in Christ, by personal trust in him. Till then there is, there can be, no salvation for them. No good works, no prayers, no tears, no round of religious duties, can secure the life of God for any soul; nothing short of personally touching him, of being united to him by faith, can bring the tide of God's life in Christ into any lost soul. But when any soul destitute of a holy life, dead and desolate in sin, touches

Christ, in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, by a genuine faith, then in the twinkling of an eye death ceases, and spiritual life with all its surging tides of blessing, of peace and joy flows into that soul. He that hath not the Son hath not life; but he that hath the Son hath life; and that life, as the great Apostle wrote, is hid with Christ in God. So in the light of our subject we can have no success in preaching except as we preach Christ, and under God bring men into touch with Christ by their faith. No wonder that Paul said, "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." For only he who died for us and rose again, and lives forevermore can make dead souls live.

THE IMPORT OF JOHN 21:15-17

THE IMPORT OF JOHN 21:15-17

It seems to me to be probable that the Gospel usually attributed to the Apostle John closes with the twentieth chapter. Its concluding sentences are,—"Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." Here the author refers to certain events which he has not incorporated in his writing; calls what he has written "this book," and specifically states the object which he had in view in writing it. If there were not another chapter, every intelligent reader would regard this as a very natural and fitting close to all that goes before in this Gospel.

Still, what is presented in the opening sentences of the twenty-first chapter is very closely and vitally linked with the events before related: "After these things Jesus manifested himself again to the disciples at the Sea of Tiberias." It is not, therefore, surprising that some thoughtful interpreters should conclude, that, notwithstanding the last words of the preceding chapter seem to note a formal close of the Gospel, it did not end there, but instead, the author wrote right

on without lapse of time or break of thought to the close of the twenty-first chapter. Nevertheless, to my own mind, the most natural and satisfactory view is that the Gospel really closes with the last words of the twentieth chapter; and that after a longer or shorter period the author added what we have in the twenty-first chapter as a postscript. By the concatenation of events it is vitally linked with the preceding, but in form it appears to be something added to that which had been considered as finished. This view satisfactorily accounts both for the juxtaposition of thought and the form of literary expression.

The author's motive for writing this postscript seems to have been twofold. First, his Gospel may have been criticised as fragmentary and incomplete. He therefore decided to add an account of the very important manifestation of the risen Lord to his disciples at the Sea of Tiberias. Having done this, at the close of the postscript he formally defends the incompleteness of his Gospel by saying, "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." But, in the second place, from what transpired at this third manifestation of Christ to his disciples, a report sprang up and had gone abroad among believers that Jesus had declared that the author of this Gospel should not die. It was a false report and on that ground alone, an honest man would be strongly moved to contradict

it; but the report put the writer into wrong relations with his fellow disciples. As the brethren of Joseph regarded him as a favorite of their father, so, if this false rumor should remain uncontradicted, the disciples might regard the writer of this Gospel as one on whom Jesus had conferred special honors. If the report should not be corrected, it might awaken jealousies, jeopardize the success of the apostle's labor, and stand in the way of the establishment of the Kingdom of God. So, near the close of his postscript he takes pains explicitly and positively to contradict it.

If it should be asked why the author did not in his postscript simply deny the false rumor concerning himself, without treating at considerable length the third manifestation of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection, the obvious answer is, that he felt it to be important to place fully before the disciples all the circumstances out of which such a rumor arose. Thus all could see how naturally it sprung up, and that it was simply a perversion of a very important ethical lesson. This lesson we shall consider later in its proper relation.

That the body of the Gospel and this postscript were written by the same hand scarcely admits of a doubt. Both were evidently penned by an eyewitness. We grant that there may be some incidents delineated in this Gospel of which the writer may not have been personally cognizant and which may have been reported to him by Jesus himself;

but nearly the whole of this Gospel is manifestly the testimony of what the writer saw and heard. Take for instance the record of the first miracle at Cana of Galilee, where as invited guests at a wedding were Jesus, his mother and his disciples. During the progress of the feast the wine is exhausted. On account of it the family is greatly embarrassed, and Jesus' mother, sharing in their anxiety, hastens to her Son and delicately suggests to him that he should work a miracle to meet the exigency. He gently rebukes her. She, however, nothing daunted, said to the servants, "Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it." In due time he said to them, "Fill with water the six stone waterpots," and they filled them up to the brim. Then in the presence of its Lord the water blushes into wine; whereupon he commands them to draw it out and bear it to the ruler of the feast. He in astonishment comments on the superior excellence of the wine. If any one should now tell a story of a wedding, artlessly painting the scene in all of its interesting details, the hearer would instinctively exclaim, "Why, you were there then!"; and the hearer would think for the nonce that he was there too. What may be said of this, we are also constrained to say of most of the scenes depicted in this Gospel. Jesus at Jacob's well, in the household at Bethany, at the grave of Lazarus, in the upper room where he said to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger and see my hands," and many other notable incidents are so narrated that ordinary, intelligent readers never

for a moment doubt that we have here the words of one who saw and heard what he reports.

If we turn to this postscript we find the same subtle, convincing evidence that the writer of it declared what was presented to his eye and ear. There were together seven disciples; three of them are named by the writer and partially described; two are not named but are so described that we know who they were; two others are not identified. Then we have the declaration by the foremost disciple that he is going a fishing, and the quick response of the rest that they would go with him. Then follows their fruitless toiling during the night, the stranger on the shore just at the grey dawn, his friendly salutation, and his direction as to handling the net which brought instant success, the swim of Peter to the shore, the burning coals, the bread, the fish, the breakfast, the colloquy that followed,—all so unmistakably suggest the words of an eye and ear witness, that a fool could not err in reference to it. If an eye-witness wrote this Gospel and this postscript of it, they were not written by some elder, whose name was John, who lived about the middle of the second century.

Again, the style of both the Gospel and the postscript shows that the same hand that wrote the one wrote also the other. The style of this writer is distinctive, unique; it is distinctive in its severe simplicity; in its clear and subtle distinctions; in its suggestions of vast unexplored regions of thought. The critics say that he did not write

good Greek, classical Greek; grant it, but he so wrote that he has impressed and stirred the profoundest intellects of all the ages of the Christian church, and has also been read with special delight and profit by the lowly of all lands. And this simple, subtle, suggestive style characterizes both the Gospel and its postscript.

Moreover, this eye-witness with his unmatched style sets forth in both the Gospel and the postscript the same great thought. While fully and unhesitatingly presenting to us the humanity of Christ, he wrote that he might set forth with special emphasis his divine nature, his deity. So the first sentence of his Gospel is: "In the beginning," in eternity, "was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten [begotten as no other being ever was] from the Father), full of grace and truth." In Jesus' conflict with the Pharisees he announces himself as that bread that came down from heaven, of which if a man eat he shall never hunger; he claims that he shall raise the dead and judge the world, and calls upon all men to honor him even as they honor the Father; he declares that he existed before Abraham, that he that hath seen him hath seen the Father, that all that the Father possesses he possesses,—"All things that are mine are thine, and thine are mine"; he prays to the Father, "Glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world

was." And just at the close of the Gospel, Thomas, delivered from all doubt of Christ's resurrection, said unto him, "My Lord and my God." Then the writer of the Gospel adds: "These things are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

The great truth that Jesus is the Son of God, the divine Lord, is also the central, unifying thought of the postscript. It is the risen Lord that manifests himself on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias, provides food for his hungry followers, controls the fish of the sea, presents himself as the supreme object of their love, commands the foremost disciple to follow him, unveils to him the manner of his death, and speaks of his own future coming.

Who is the eye-witness that wrote both this Gospel and postscript alike in style, and dominated by the same great vitalizing thought, a divine Saviour? The writer himself replies: "I am he who leaned back on his breast (on Jesus' breast) at the supper, and said, 'Lord, who is he that betrayeth Thee?' I wrote these things, and know that what I have written is true." And after all the hair-splitting criticism of the past and of today, on good and sufficient evidence we hold fast to the position that John the apostle wrote both the Gospel and the postscript.

But a more important matter demands our attention. What is the real significance of this postscript? What is its central, unifying idea? Is it not Peter's confession of supreme love to

the divine Christ and his public restoration to the office that the Master had called him to fill, and from which, by his denial he had fallen? So far as we are able let us grasp the meaning of this great passage of Scripture.

Since his resurrection, Jesus had already appeared twice to the eleven; once to ten of them on the evening of his resurrection day, in the upper room at Jerusalem, Thomas being absent; one week later in the same room to them all, Thomas being present, when with all the ardor of his nature he said to Christ, "My Lord and my God." Now for many days Jesus left these disciples to their own reflections. At last time began to hang heavily on mind and heart; for their own happiness they needed employment. Most of them also were poor. It is not unlikely that their purses needed replenishing. In these circumstances it was very natural for them to turn to that calling with which they were most familiar. And just as we should reasonably expect, the energetic, impulsive Peter was the first to say to his fellows, "I go a fishing." It needed only this declaration from him to elicit their prompt response, "We also come with thee." They got into a boat in the evening and pushed out a little way from shore, and began their toil for the night. There were only seven of them, Peter, Thomas, Nathaniel, James and John, and two others whose names are not mentioned. As it is sometimes with fishermen, their toil during the live-long night was bootless. Just at the break of day they

saw, as they supposed, a stranger on the shore. But this stranger evidently had a lively interest in them, for his voice came sweetly across the waters, "Children, have ye aught to eat?" They respectfully answered the questioner, "No." Did not the address, "children" make them think that he was not wholly a stranger? He cried to them, "Cast the net on the right side of the boat, and ye shall find." There was something commanding and compelling in the words that he uttered, for they at once do his bidding. Immediately the net is filled with fish. It is so heavy that they are not able to draw it up into the boat; they can only drag it along in the sea. What passed through John's mind we do not certainly know. Perhaps he remembered a similar draught of fishes from that same sea soon after they began to follow the Lord. Perhaps he thought, there stands the one who is Lord of "whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." But whatever was the process of his thought, as soon as the net was filled with fishes, John said to Peter, "It is the Lord!" When Peter heard that, he girt his coat about him, plunged into the sea and swam straight to the shore. He must be the first to greet his Lord! Peter's feeling was vastly different from what it was when, near the beginning of Christ's ministry, obeying the word of Jesus he let down his net and enclosed a multitude of fishes. At that time he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord"; but Peter had grown spiritually since that day. Now,

instead of praying the Lord to depart from him he swims to the shore that he may at once be with him. What passed between them we do not know. The rest of the disciples came in the boat dragging the net with fishes. Stepping upon the shore an unexpected sight greeted their eyes. There were at their feet glowing coals, toasting bread and broiling fish. Their Lord had not been unmindful of their hunger, and had bountifully provided for their wants. But since it is his will that men should ever co-operate with him in meeting their necessities, he said, "Bring of the fish which ye have now taken." It is now the ardent, zealous Peter, who, before any of his fellow disciples, steps onto the boat, grasps the net and drags it to the shore. How natural the action that follows! They all gather about the full but unrent net and count the fishes taken out, perhaps more than once, and find that there are one hundred, fifty and three. Some of them are now probably dressed and broiled that the repast may be abundant for these hungry fishermen. And when all is ready, the Lord, the provider of the table, says to them, "Come and break your fast," just our familiar, "Come to breakfast."

But thus far in the passage there is no hint that the disciples talked with Jesus. There is a strong indication that they did not. They seemed to have been filled with reverential awe. They knew that it was the Lord; but, as gratifying as it would have been to have their positive conviction confirmed by a declaration from his lips, no one of

them ventured to ask, "Who art thou?" And at the moment when the breakfast was fully prepared, Jesus seemed to have been standing a little aloof from them, for he "*cometh* and taketh the bread and giveth them, and the fish likewise." He who provided the feast is both the host and the servant of his hungry brethren.

We come now to the great central lesson of the Scripture in hand. The preceding lessons are of high import. The waiting of these disciples after their risen Lord showed himself to them the second time must have seemed to them long and weary. It must have been a severe trial to their faith. But his third appearance to them showed them that their Lord had not forgotten or abandoned them. Ever watchful over them, and still training them for their future labor, he once more taught them by this draught of fishes that their future success in catching men, lifting them out of this world and bringing them into his kingdom, depended on prompt obedience to his word; not by their toil alone, however persistent, but by his accompanying and energizing word should they realize their mission. That draught of fishes was putting into concrete form the old, but ever vital prophetic message, "Not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit saith the Lord of hosts." He had also taught them by the breakfast which he had prepared for them on the shore that it was his purpose to care even for the bodily wants of his toiling disciples. They were not to expect luxury, but such wholesome food as would fit them

for the most efficient labor in saving souls. But all this simply led up to a still more important lesson for them all, and especially for Peter, to whom it was particularly directed.

The breakfast was over. The appetites of all were satisfied. The divine host, the risen Lord, turned his eyes full upon Peter. It may have reminded that disciple of the look which the suffering Saviour gave him in the palace of Caiaphas, which melted him to repentance; and as the risen Lord looked way down into the depths of Peter's heart, the searching words were poured into his ears, "Simon, son of John (R. V.), lovest thou me more than these?" This disciple had received from his Lord the name of Peter, but in this interview Jesus discards it and goes back to the old name of his disciple. In view of what he did at his Lord's trial before Caiaphas, to have called him Peter, Rock, would have been little short of cutting, bitter sarcasm. This, in probing Peter's conscience, the Lord avoids.

Also in this first question Jesus used the phrase, "More than these." The interrogatory was, "Do you love me more genuinely, more truly than do your fellow disciples? Is your love superior to that of these brethren with whom you have just partaken of this frugal meal?" This carried Peter back a few days to the time of his self-confidence and self-assurance, to the hour when his Lord said, "All ye shall be offended in me this night," and he in his overweening trust in himself had contradicted his Master and declared, "If all shall

be offended in thee," if all shall stumble into sin because of thee, on account of what thou art or dost, "I will never be offended," I will never stumble into sin, thus putting himself above his fellows. And when in spite of his lofty and loud profession of fidelity Jesus said to him, "This night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice," he vehemently affirmed, "Even if I must die with thee, yet will I not deny thee." But while his boastful words still rung in the ears of his fellow disciples, he, on account of what his Lord was passing through, stumbled more deeply into sin than any of them, cowardly denying his Lord, even with cursing and swearing. Of his assumed superiority over his fellows, of his boastfulness and shameful fall, those words, "more than these," forcefully reminded him. But when he answered the heart-searching question, he made no allusion to others, but simply affirmed his love to his Lord, justifying the sincerity of his profession by appealing to the Lord's knowledge of his heart: "Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." Boastfulness over others is gone; trust in the omniscient Lord has taken the place of trust in self. On the basis of this profession of his love, the Master bade him, "Feed my lambs."

But the Lord said the second time, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" and received the same answer as before; and on the basis of Peter's twice-professed love he bade him, "Tend my sheep."

But the third time the same question came from the lips of the risen Lord, and "Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, lovest thou me?" Why was he grieved?

Ordinarily such repetition of a question would suggest to the one interrogated that the questioner doubted his truthfulness. But Peter's twice-repeated "Thou knowest that I love thee" seems to me to preclude the entertainment of any such notion by him. And Jesus' commands, "Feed my lambs,—tend my sheep," apparently show that Jesus thoroughly believed that Peter was honest and that his love was genuine. So Peter could not have been grieved by entertaining the notion that the Lord doubted him.

His grief arose from the fact that the third repetition of the question brought back vividly and powerfully the whole scene of his cowardly denial. Before his fall Jesus said to him, "Thou shalt deny me thrice"—*three times.* When he had entered into the court of the palace of Caiaphas, the maid that kept the door accused him of being a disciple of the Nazarene, and he denied it. He now retreated from the fire in the open court, where he was warming himself, into the shadow of the arch that led from the street to the court; but very soon another maid saw him and said to the crowd in the court, "This man also was with Jesus the Nazarene," and he denied it with an oath and reiterated this denial when those standing around the fire in the open court, joining the maid in her accusation, asked him, "Art thou also

one of his disciples?" Twice now, before all those in the open court he has denied his Lord, confirming his last denial with a solemn oath.

About an hour after, they in the open court declared to Peter, "Of a truth thou art also one of them, for thy speech betrayeth thee," thou art a Galilean. And one of them directly appealed to him, "Did I not see thee in the garden with him?" Peter now lost his balance, began to curse and swear, and declare between his oaths that he did not know Jesus. This is the third denial. Now the Lord turned and looked upon Peter. Then the crowing of the cock brought to the mind of the faithless disciple Jesus' words, "Verily I say unto thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice"—*three times.* Keenly conscious of his threefold denial Peter wept, and went out of the court and found some secret place and there wept bitterly. That *three-fold denial* prophesied by Christ, enacted by Peter, was branded upon the very substance of his soul. He could never forget it. Tradition says that ever after there was a tear in his eye. Jesus by the words, "more than these," had already carried him back to the hour of his boastful self-confidence, and the whole sad history that followed was vividly before him. He heard the Master again, "Thou shalt deny me three times,"—his three awful denials sounded through the halls of his memory; nothing so aroused and touched him to the quick as that *three times.* This the Master knew; and that he might probe his disciple's con-

science to the core, three times he asked, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" But when he asked it the third time, Peter's soul was pierced with the sharpest grief, and he answered, very likely with tears and sobs, "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee." "Jesus said unto him, Feed my sheep."

What was the Lord's object in all this? Surely he would not have caused his disciple to feel any unnecessary pang. But Peter had greatly sinned. The fact that all things considered he was the foremost disciple made his offence all the greater. So the Lord determined thoroughly to probe his conscience; that through and through he might be contrite and might realize in the very depths of his consciousness that he had repented of his great sin. And it was important also that he should make his three-fold confession of his love for Jesus before his fellow disciples, that they too might be fully and impressively assured of the depth and genuineness of his compunction.

Nor must we forget that he had been openly chosen by Christ to do a great and specific work, and had been put by him into the most exalted office of the infant church. On the one hand he was called to be a fisher of men—that was his distinctive task; but on the other hand, he with others had been separated from the rank and file of the followers of Christ and made an apostle,—that was his high station.

Moreover, with two others he had been distinguished even from the twelve and drawn into

closer personal relations with his Lord than they. On account of this intimate relationship he went with Jesus up into the Mount of Transfiguration. In an ever memorable interview he had been foremost in confessing that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God," and in turn had received the special blessing of his Lord. When Jesus felt the sorest need of human sympathy, Peter with James and John had gone with him into the shadow and gloom of Gethsemane. But by his open and thrice-repeated denial of the Lord who had so highly honored him, he had miserably fallen from his high vocation and office and brought discredit upon his great confession. It was therefore necessary that his restoration to his work and office should be, if possible, as public and conspicuous as had been his denial and fall. He himself needed to know that his Lord had not only forgiven his great sin, but had recalled him to his work and had put him once more into his former position. If in the future he was to work effectively for the salvation of men, there must not be so much as one faint, lingering doubt of his complete pardon by his Lord and full restoration to his work and apostleship. This was necessary, not only for him, but also for his fellow apostles. To insure their faith in Peter and in his leadership, they too must know beyond a peradventure that the past had been blotted out by Christ, and that he who under stress and in fear had denied his Lord, had once more his full confidence, and

was re-commissioned by him to do the work and to fill the office to which he was originally called.

So the Master, in the presence of six of Peter's apostolic associates, bids him three times, answering to his threefold denial and threefold confession of love, to care for and nourish the lambs and sheep of his flock. If, in the future, some one objecting should say, "Why is this apostle, who thrice denied his Lord, so prominent and aggressive in service?"—six men, associates with him in labor, could bear witness that the risen Lord, in their presence and hearing, three times commanded him to do this work; he solemnly re-commissioned him thrice over to care for those who believe in him and follow him; over against each shameful denial he placed his renewed commission, "Feed my lambs; Feed my sheep." And if, thereafter, the conscience of Peter at times should accuse him afresh for his recreant acts and words in the palace of Caiaphas—as it doubtless did—he would hear over against his repeated denial the Master's repeated re-commission, and be reassured and comforted and enabled to go on in peace with his great work.

While his work was *one,* it was two-sided. He was under Christ to bring men out of the world into the kingdom of God; according to the terms of his original commission he was to catch men—and then nourish them and build them up "into the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Peter certainly did the first; how suc-

cessfully the results of his preaching at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and subsequently in the house of Cornelius in Cæsarea testify. But it is worthy of note that when the risen Lord, at the Sea of Tiberias, re-commissioned Peter it was the second phase of his work that he specially emphasized, the nourishing, the caring for the sheep. Jesus had intimated to Peter, even before his denial, that this was to be his pre-eminent task. Predicting his temporary downfall, he said—oh, with what tender solicitude—"But I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not; and do thou when once thou hast turned again, establish thy brethren." The Epistles of Peter bear witness that the apostle gave himself with great assiduity to the work of feeding "the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia." And in his first Epistle the once self-confident apostle strengthened the brethren not only with the great central truths of the Gospel, but also out of the depths of his own experience as he wrote: "Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility, to serve one another; for God resisteth the proud"—that is the cry from Peter's soul, when he went out and wept bitterly—"but giveth grace to the humble"—an echo of what was granted to contrite humble Peter when his risen Lord, forgiving and forgetting his great sin, said to him, "Feed my lambs."

And we must not fail to notice that the Lord in this personal colloquy with Peter made love, just as Paul did, the supreme grace. He did not

ask his penitent apostle whether he believed in him, or had hope of eternal life, but whether he loved him, and on the emphatic confession of that grace he publicly restored him to his work and office. The Lord demanded positive, unmistakable love because that grace pre-eminently determines character. What a man loves reveals unerringly what he is.

Moreover, the object towards which we must exercise supreme love is here clearly presented to us. "Lovest thou *me?*" Jesus did not ask, "Dost thou love God?"—although he had taught with iteration and emphasis that the first great commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind" (Matt. 22:37). Did he then in this colloquy with Peter repudiate what he had before taught? Nay, verily! He who talked with penitent Simon, "in the beginning"—in eternity —"was with God, and was God." It was he concerning whom Jehovah said: "Let all the angels of God worship him." He had become flesh and dwelt among us. He had conquered death on our behalf. Just because he was God, he claimed for himself the absolute love of Peter. "Lovest thou *me?*" Before his crucifixion he said to Philip: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father"; and with his reiterated question to Simon before us, without any fear of making a mistake, we can add: "He that loves the risen Lord loves the Father." That the Father is well pleased when we render supreme love to Christ, Jesus declares

in these words: "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father" (John 14: 21).

But in the report of Christ's conversation with penitent Peter on the shore of Tiberias, do the words used by John to designate the act of loving throw any special light on this great transaction? In the first and second questions we have *agapao;* this word signifies loving with esteem; it usually involves the notion of admiration of righteous character, and the purpose of bestowing kindness on the one esteemed and admired. Its Latin synonym is *diligo.* It is a word that pre-eminently expresses the Christian conception of loving.

In the third question we find *phileo.* This signifies love which expresses itself through feeling, emotion; it conveys the notion of instinctive, warm, personal affection. This verb is found in every one of Peter's replies; probably expressing his warm personal affection for Jesus. Its Latin synonym is *amo.* Some interpreters think that Jesus' use of *phileo* instead of *agapao,* in the third question, was what caused the grief of Peter; they suggest that the word made Peter think that the Lord called in question his personal attachment to him, and this broke the heart of the ardent disciple.

But all such interpretations, it seems to me, inject into the text what it does not contain. We grant freely that there is a distinction between the two verbs, *agapao* and *phileo;* but the demarcation between them is not rigid and absolute. The classical Greek writer expressed by *phileo* not

only warm personal love, but also love of esteem for character. But, confining ourselves simply to the writings of the New Testament, it is clear that in them these two words were sometimes used interchangeably. To be sure, *agapao* is used in a very large majority of the passages where the act of love is set forth, but not in all. And it is not always used to express esteem for righteousness or righteous character, but sometimes to express the love of self and pelf. For example, the Pharisees loved (*agapao*) the chief seats in the synagogue (Luke 11:43), and Balaam, the son of Beor, loved (*agapao*) the hire of wrong-doing. And while *agapao* is more frequently employed by New Testament writers than *phileo,* the latter is often used by them to set forth love not only in the lower but also in the higher relations, and they employed both alike to express love on the same plane and for the same object. For example, Jesus says of the Pharisees (Matt. 23:6) they love (*phileo*) the chief places at feasts and the chief seats in the synagogue; whereas Luke reports (Luke 11:43) Jesus as saying to the Pharisees, "Ye love (*agapao*) the chief seats in the synagogue." In these passages the two verbs are used interchangeably; the one regarded as fit as the other to express love for that which ministers to personal vanity.

It has been claimed that *agapao* is the word used to express love in all the higher and more sacred relations of life, and we grant that in the New Testament it is by far the most frequently

employed to set forth love in such relations, but by no means exclusively. For example, while Paul (Eph. 5:25) in one Epistle exhorts husbands to love (*agapao*) their wives, in another Epistle (Titus 2:4) he directs that the young women be trained to love (*phileo*) their husbands and their children. *Phileo* is also used in the same Epistle to express brotherly love (Titus 3:15): "Salute them that love (*phileo*) us in faith." And in 1 Pet. 3:8 we read: "Loving (*phileo*) as brethren"; the Greek word is a compound, "brethren-lovers."

Phileo is also used in the New Testament to express the love that men should have to the Lord. Paul wrote to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 16:22): "If any man loveth (*phileo*) not the Lord, let him be anathema." And it is also employed to set forth Christ's love both to his special friends and to his children. Of his love to his special friends we have two examples, in both of which the two verbs are used interchangeably (John 11:5): "Now Jesus loved (*agapao*) Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus"; but as Jesus went weeping to the grave of Lazarus, the Jews who were looking on said, "Behold how he loved (*phileo*) him." But, if possible, we have a more striking example of the interchangeable use of these verbs in the characterization of Jesus' special love for John. In John 13:23 we read: "There was at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom one of his disciples whom Jesus loved" (*agapao*); but on the morning of the resurrection, we are

told by the same writer (20:2), that Mary Magdalene "cometh to Simon Peter and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved" (*phileo*).

But in the Revelation the love of the exalted and glorified Jesus for his followers is expressed by *phileo* (Rev. 3:19), "As many as I love (*phileo*) I rebuke and chasten." But our argument is cumulative, since, in the New Testament the love of God the Father for his children is expressed by *phileo*. Jesus, in his great farewell discourse, said to his disciples (John 16:27): "For the Father himself loveth you (*phileo*), because ye have loved (*phileo*) me." Here we have both the love of God to his children and their love to his eternal Son expressed by *phileo*. But *phileo* was regarded by John as a fit vehicle for the expression of the love of God the Father for his only-begotten Son (John 5:20). In reporting Jesus' words he says, "For the Father loveth (*phileo*) the Son."

We see, then, that *phileo* is employed by New Testament writers, and especially by the writer of the Fourth Gospel, to express love even in all the highest and most sacred relations of men to one another and to God, and of God to men, and even of the Father to the Son. Moreover, we have seen how the author of the Fourth Gospel, at times, uses the two verbs, *agapao* and *phileo,* interchangeably. If he did this in the body of his Gospel, in all probability he did it also in the postscript of his Gospel. And such marked distinctions between these verbs as the critics have

made, distinctions of which John evidently never dreamed, loads a simple and important narrative with far-fetched philological speculations which obscure its real meaning, which shroud its light in mist. John probably instinctively used both of these verbs, which are substantially synonymous, just as any writer would do now, simply to give variety to his diction and avoid monotony of style.

But still another consideration, it seems to us, ought to check the speculations of commentators on the difference in the meaning of these two verbs. Whether Jesus in his colloquy with Peter used one word to express the act of loving or two words we cannot tell.

If he used two, whether there was a shade of difference between them we cannot now ascertain. We have no conclusive evidence that he spoke Greek. That he possibly might have done so we must of course grant, since both John and Peter, a few years later, wrote in that tongue. But scholars generally hold that Jesus spoke Aramaic. In that dialect of the Hebrew he and Peter probably spoke with each other on the shore of Tiberias. That John has faithfully reported the conversation I, for one, have not the shadow of a doubt. But if in the colloquy Jesus used two words to express the act of loving, nobody now knows what they were, so no one can now intelligently speculate about them. While the two verbs found in John's report, we have already shown, were used interchangeably by him in his Gospel

and in all probability in the twenty-first chapter, which we have treated as a postscript to his Gospel.

It still remains for us to inquire what is meant by the love on which Jesus so strenuously insisted. Not, certainly, simply emotion excited by some object and lavished upon it. That emotion attends love is true, but it is not the love itself. In the last analysis love is pre-eminently preference. One who loves prefers some object above all others, and that preference bends all the powers of the one preferring to the service of the object supremely preferred. Such a preference, leading all the activities of the soul in its train is always attended with pleasurable sensibility, often with powerful emotion; but to mistake the sensibility or the emotion for the love, for supreme preference, frequently leads to mischief. Now, this is the purport of Jesus' question to Peter. "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me, preferest thou me above all others? So preferest thou me that every energy of thy being flows full-tide into glad service to me?"

This question leads us finally to ask, What are the fruits of such love? Regarding Christ as the one supremely preferred, such preference, such love, naturally expresses itself in obedience and service. And here we discern another ligament which binds this postscript with the body of the Gospel. Christ in his last great discourse to his disciples before his agony in the garden said: "If ye love me ye will keep my commandments." He

here calls on Peter to illustrate this general principle in his life. By his probing questions he makes his disciple more profoundly conscious of love to him; he still further deepens Peter's consciousness of love by leading him ardently to profess it again and again, and at each profession of it he calls upon him to manifest it in obedience and loving service. "Thou knowest that I love thee," says the penitent Peter; "Then," says the risen Lord, "show your love by tenderly caring for my sheep."

But such love not only expresses itself in assiduous toil for others, but it enables those who exercise it to endure without murmur the severest hardships and sharpest trials in the service of their divine Lord. Jesus had no sooner said in response to Simon's third confession of his love, "Feed my sheep," than, without a break, he went straight on to say to him: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young thou girdest thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. But this he spake, signifying by what manner of death he should glorify God. And when he had spoken this, he said unto him, Follow me."

The writer has not left us in doubt as to the main import of these words; they were a prophecy that Peter, after he had grown gray in his Master's service, should suffer a violent death. "Thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another

shall gird thee,'' may be a distinctive prophecy that he should be taken into custody by the officers of the government, who would bind his hands with cords, just as they bound Jesus' hands when they apprehended him in the Garden of Gethsemane, and carry him whither he would not—take him away to his trial in the court—or the words may refer to death by crucifixion. When one was crucified he was not always nailed to a cross, but sometimes lashed to it by cords. The cross was laid on the ground, the victim was bound to it; it was then lifted with the victim upon it to an upright position and made fast in the earth. The few words of Jesus may have been an outline picture of this. But if reasonable objection may be made to any specific interpretation of the words, John, by his comment has made it clear that they refer to Simon's martyrdom. And that reveals their vital connection with what goes immediately before. For when Jesus had predicted Simon's violent death he said to him, ''Follow me.'' ''Your love must be such that it will lead you to follow me, whatever awaits you. You may have manifold and bitter trials; a violent death when you are an old man will be your lot, nevertheless, follow me; if that love that you have thrice so emphatically confessed is genuine, you will not only gladly feed my sheep, but for my sake you will die without a murmur, lashed to a cross.''

''But last of all, if your love is genuine it will enable you to be steadfast in my service irrespec-

tive of what I do to others." Peter followed his risen Lord as he walked along the shore of the Sea of Tiberias, and looking back he saw John a little behind them, also following. Now as the Lord had lifted the curtain and revealed to Peter something of his future, his curiosity was excited to know what was to be John's career and fate; so he asked: "Lord, and what shall this man do?" Jesus said unto him, "If I will that he tarry till I come what is that to thee?" Then again Jesus said to him, "Follow thou me." "No matter how I may order the life of John, his career and fate do not change your duty. If I will that he tarry on the earth until I come again, that will not absolve you from my service. If you indeed love me you will follow me, however much the condition of others may differ from your own."

This chapter, then, so full of varied and interesting incident is instinct with one great thought, the genuine love of the disciple for his Master. All the events in the first of the chapter lead directly up to the question which the risen Lord asks Simon. It is an inquiry as to the fact of his love to Him. His love for Jesus is thrice confessed. Its fruit is obedient service, no matter how bitter the trials such service may involve, or how the Lord may see fit to make our condition to differ from that of others.

We have considered not merely an interesting fact of Gospel history, but a truth which "takes hold on our business and bosoms." Simon's risen Lord is ours also. He asks us, as we read

this Scripture, the same question that He asked him. James, son of Charles, lovest thou me? Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Then nurture those children that I have given thee "in the chastening and admonition of the Lord." Theodore, son of Christopher, lovest thou me? Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Then use honestly thy talent for making money, and gather wealth not for selfish ends, but for the betterment of your fellow men. Jacob, son of Robert, lovest thou me? Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Then go out into the streets and lanes of thy city, find those who do not know me and tell them of my love and my salvation. Martha, daughter of Alfred, lovest thou me? Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Then, make home for thy children the most attractive place on earth, and so far as possible minister to the sick and cheer the disconsolate in thine own neighborhood, remembering that inasmuch as thou doest it unto even the least of these thou doest it unto me. Both our usefulness and our destiny are determined by the answer that we can truthfully give to our risen Lord's soul-testing question, "Lovest thou me?"

THE REASONABLENESS OF ETERNAL PUNISHMENT

THE REASONABLENESS OF ETERNAL PUNISHMENT

God has given to man freedom of choice and of action. All agree that God made man so far forth free, that he is strictly responsible for what he deliberately does. At the same time each man has his moral and spiritual affinities. If his moral character is essentially bad, if he is spiritually corrupt, so that he loves and cherishes sin, his affinities lead him to choose the society of wicked men. If, though imperfect, he is at heart holy, he seeks the society of the holy. The spiritual affinities of men may, indeed, be changed, since the characters of men may be, and often are, transformed. Then we see those who have been lovers of sin quitting the ranks of the depraved that they may join themselves to God's people. But in this world, where the good and the evil are often strangely thrown together, through temporary motives and circumstances, a man, for a season, may be outwardly united to those with whom he has no spiritual affinity. This was the case with Judas. For some reason, even when, in the language of Christ, he was a devil, he joined himself to the disciples. Perhaps he retained his place out of love for the money-bag which they asked him to carry, the contents of which probably often stuck to his covetous,

viscous fingers. But he was out of place. And when he could make more money by betraying his Lord than he could by following him, he did not hesitate to desert Christ and the disciples, to unite himself to their enemies, and act the part of the traitor. He went where his spiritual affinities led him.

We find this principle verified on every hand. Converted men go straight into Christian society. They can feel at home nowhere else. Those wedded to sin seek the company of the godless. It requires much persuasion, and strong personal influence, to induce them to spend even an hour in the place where the holiest of God's people meet to pray. Where worldlings, or the profane, or the drunken, or libertines assemble, they find congenial society. They go voluntarily to their own place.

But the same laws which govern men in this world will govern them in the next. Death does not transform a man's character, it simply removes him to another place and to other scenes. Crossing a river or stepping behind a curtain does not essentially change a man's moral nature, nor alter his spiritual affinities. What they were on the one side, they are on the other. When a man, by death, steps behind the curtain which hides from us the unseen world, he continues to be the same man that he was in the moment of dissolution. The same laws of thinking, of loving, of choosing, and willing, which controlled and governed him here, control and govern him there.

His moral character and spiritual affinities remain essentially the same. Just as he chose his society here, he chooses it there. If he belongs to Christ and is holy, he goes from choice to be with his Lord and with the redeemed. If he belongs to Satan, and loves sin, he goes, from choice, to be with the devil and his angels. Just as Judas did, when he had added to the crime of the betrayal that of self-murder, he went to his own place.

It is a mistaken notion that God arbitrarily thrusts men into hell, that, by power exerted upon them from without, he forces them into a place and into society for which they have no affinity. He is represented by the popular language of the Scriptures as casting them into hell, but he evidently does this without doing any violence to the established laws of man's being; he does it by acting in and through those laws. In harmony with this thought Christ says, speaking of the final judgment on the wicked, "these shall go," that is voluntarily, "into everlasting punishment," just as the righteous shall go voluntarily "into life eternal." And Judas is represented as going voluntarily to his own place.

God does not keep men out of heaven. He plies them with every possible motive to induce them to prepare for it and enter it. John, on the island of Patmos, saw heaven as a resplendent city of precious stones and massive pearls and gold. He said the gates of it were not shut at all by day, and that there was no night there.

The gates of heaven always stand wide open, while "without are dogs and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie"; but the angels, with all their persuasive eloquence, could not induce one of those lost spirits to enter, even for a moment, through those open gates of pearl. Heaven is not their place. They have no affinity for its holiness.

"The heavenly gates stand open,
What is it keeps them out,
That weary crowd of wailers
Who stand and weep without?
What strange, mysterious safeguard
Protects the open door,
That not one guilty footstep
Has stained the crystal floor?

"Ah soul, why wonder further?
Turn but one glance within;
Thou hast the dreadful secret
Hid in thy heart of sin.
That heart which hates its Saviour,
And spurns his love untold
Would dread the pearly portal,
And shun the streets of gold."

But when wicked men have gone to their own place will their spiritual affinities ever be so changed that they will seek the society of the holy? This is in substance the question that has been often asked. Some admit that there is a hell; but they doubt as to whether the punishment of the lost will be eternal. They think it possible that even Judas may yet enter into

everlasting fellowship with Christ whom he sold for thirty pieces of silver, and then, having betrayed him with a hypocritical kiss, departed and hung himself.

But is there, even on philosophical grounds, any room for such a view? Assuredly, first of all, the manifest effect of sin on the human heart is wholly at variance with such a notion. There is in all who cherish and habitually commit sin an alarming and powerful tendency toward fixedness in it. Every act of transgression makes stronger the bonds of the sinner, and lessens the probability of his recovery from sin. This is a fact so notorious that it is well understood by all. In view of it Jeremiah exclaimed, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil." Men enter hell whose habits of sinning are already fixed. And every moment, as they continue to sin, they are growing into still greater fixedness in evil. The longer one continues in the world of the lost, therefore, the farther any hope of his recovery recedes.

But not only the habit of sinning becomes inveterate, but there is constant progress in moral corruption. Men never, even in this life, stand still in sin. They go from bad to worse. They constantly press their way downward into greater depths of iniquity. The inward bias toward sin is incessantly augmented, while the restraints of conscience from within, and the checks of public opinion from without, are perpetually weak-

ened. This needs no proof. The awful fact is patent to every mind. But here there are some barriers which resist man's propensities to sin. Conscience at times awakes and utters its sharp and solemn protests. The good speak words of warning. Christian friends pour forth their tender entreaties. The Sabbath, the sanctuary, and the Bible confront the transgressor that they may save him from impending ruin. But when the sinner shall have gone to his own place, all of these checks to his progress in evil, save perchance one, will have been withdrawn forever. If conscience shall still continue to reprove and lash the lost, as it failed here on earth permanently to stay the sinner's progress in evil, so it must just as signally fail in the future world; but, long disregarded, it may, perhaps, sink into everlasting slumber. And in that world of woe there will be none of the good—that is not their place—to entreat the sinning. No Sabbath, no sanctuary, no Bible, will be there to warn and bless. Men, there, will be left to themselves, their tendency to evil ever increasing, while every influence from without will be evil, and only evil. If men with rapid pace sweep onward in sin here, how much more rapidly there? What hope, we ask, can there be that the spiritual affinities of wicked men will ever be changed after they have voluntarily gone to their own place?

But many have entertained the notion that punishment is reformatory; that if sin is not eradicated from the human heart by milder means, it

will, at last, be burned out by purgatorial fires. There is however no basis for this view in the facts of human experience. What we already know disproves it. Pain, anguish, both of body and mind, is the fruit of sin; is punishment for sin. No sane man disputes that. The sufferings of our race are so manifold and exquisite that no tongue or pen can adequately portray them. This heritage of woe has been ours for thousands of years. If punishment could reform, if it be a power by which the nature of wicked men can be so changed that they will loathe sin, and love and seek holiness, this earth of ours would long since have become the very paradise of God. But, after all our sufferings, the earth is still full of moral corruption. Just in those portions where there is most of woe, there is the most of iniquity; there are the habitations of cruelty.

If we look at special sins which are followed by special and awful penalties, we learn again that punishment does not reform men, much less transform them. The man given to lust suffers the most excruciating agony, with the full knowledge that his pain is directly caused by his sin; but, after his paroxysms of suffering are over, he goes again to his transgression and shame. The drunkard suffers again and again all the horrors of delirium; he is overwhelmed with fears; he tosses himself to and fro on his bed; the beaded sweat stands on his forehead; he believes that serpents twine themselves about his body and fasten their poisonous fangs in his bloated cheeks; he knows

that this is the awful penalty for his love of the cup, but it works no reformation. He still rises early in the morning to seek strong drink. In spite of all his woe he clings to his sin with unrelaxing grip.

If we turn to the world's prison houses we see how baseless is the notion that men can be morally renovated by punishment. The Egyptian, the Assyrian, the Greek and Roman dungeons were the synonym of horror. Pains and penalties were meted out without mercy. But not a single prisoner among all the thousands that suffered amid damps and chills, in chains and stocks, was ever transformed in moral character by his fearful punishment. In fact, criminals in the prisons of Christian nations have been morally transformed only by the Gospel. Not punishment, but the revelation of divine love and truth in Christ has lifted many of them up out of sin, and brought them into fellowship with God.

It is true, however, that punishment sometimes holds evil propensities temporarily in check, until the powers of love touch the heart and transform the character. Thus judicious punishment, meted out in kindness to children, may restrain the evil which is struggling to assert itself until the love of guardian or parent shall, through the truth, work the requisite moral change. But even in the family, when there is punishment without love, that punishment, instead of working reformation, only hardens and confirms the young

culprits in sin. The punishment, itself, utterly fails to renovate the moral nature.

In fact, punishment in and of itself was never intended to reform men. It does hold temporarily in check out-cropping crime, for the safety of society. It does, as we have said, for the time being restrain evil propensities, till truth and love may touch and save the erring; but its primary object is to satisfy the demands of justice. This fact underlies and shapes the criminal codes of all nations. In these laws certain punishments are prescribed for culprits. Those who framed the laws have not sought, by the prescribed penalties, to secure the reformation of criminals. Law has nothing to do with that. Legislators, therefore, have asked, simply, what does justice demand? And they have attached to criminal laws such penalties as in the judgment of mankind will meet and satisfy the claims of justice, pure and simple.

That this is the primary object of punishment becomes clear when an entire community is aroused by some dark and bloody deed. With one voice the multitude cries out for justice to be meted out to the criminal. The throng is not blood-thirsty; it is made up of upright citizens. It is not moved by personal vindictiveness; not one in a thousand, perhaps, has ever known the culprit. There is only one solution of such a problem. The sense of justice implanted by God in every human heart is aroused, expresses itself, puts forth its majestic and awful demand, and the

speedy and condign punishment of the criminal by the courts alone will satisfy it.

That the fundamental aim of punishment is not the reformation of the transgressor, but the satisfaction of justice, is clear from the sufferings of Christ. He could not be transformed in character, for he was sinless. He suffered for our iniquities. He took on himself through sympathy the penalty due to our transgression. In this most conspicuous example of suffering in the universe, we see that reformation was not the aim of Christ's measureless agony.

If these positions are true—and who can gainsay them?—when wicked men have gone to their own place, we cannot reasonably expect that their sufferings will ever work any transformation in their characters. Punishment reforms no man here on earth; this is not its design; it certainly will not, then, reform any man who, in hell, has become vastly more depraved, and far more obdurate in transgression than he was in this life. Men, neither here nor hereafter, can ever be tortured into holiness.

But, men have asked, will there not be in the future another dispensation of love by which God will reach and save the lost? If there could be, who would not rejoice? but the Scriptures drop not the slightest hint of any such dispensation; in fact, they contain intimations to the contrary. The Spirit revealed to John in Patmos that the wicked shall finally become fixed in sin. It shall be said concerning them, "He that is un-

just, let him be unjust still, and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still." Christ in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, presents to us the saved and the lost in colloquy with each other. The lost Dives does not ask to be delivered from the tormenting flame. He evidently had no hope of that; perhaps he did not desire it; but he asked only for a drop of water to cool his tongue, for some slight alleviation of his woe. Thus the Great Teacher intimates that for the wicked who go to their own place there is no hope of salvation. But in reference to some of the lost, he gives us more than an intimation; he declares positively that whoever shall blaspheme against the Spirit, or shall speak against the Holy Spirit, shall never be forgiven, "neither in this world, nor in that which is to come."

But if there should be another dispensation of love, how could it avail, especially for those who, in spite of all the gracious influences of the Gospel, have gone from Christian lands to their own place? Could they have, in any other dispensation, a grander exhibition of God's love than they now possess? God now reveals himself to them in Christ. And Christ is "the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person." In Christ "dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Here we have the infinite God made manifest; here we have infinite love revealed. Man can never have more than that. And this infinite love is manifested now by Christ's voluntary sacrifice of himself on the cross

that he might save his enemies. Could infinite love ever display itself in a manner more tender and touching? If men are not won to God by it now, will they be, can they be, when in hell they have reached a pitch of depravity unknown here on earth? If they hear not Christ now, neither will they be persuaded, if in some future dispensation, God should manifest himself to them, through Christ, in their world of woe.

But this conclusion, to which we are inevitably brought by reasoning based on facts revealed to all in natural law, is confirmed by the clear utterance of God's word. We need not spread out the passages which teach the doctrine of future retribution. They are familiar to all, and they are so plain that a school-boy could not mistake their certain import. Christ, in the twenty-fifth of Matthew, brings before us the scene of the general judgment, and says concerning the wicked, "These shall go away into eternal punishment." But men, troubled by this doctrine and by this text, have said that the Greek word translated "eternal" does not mean unending duration, but simply a long period. It is true that the noun, from which the adjective, here translated "eternal," was derived, was sometimes used by Greek writers to designate a limited period. But the period so designated was always indefinite; its limits were never indicated; so the word naturally came to designate the thought, as nearly as we can conceive it, of eternity, which is of course unlimited. And in that sense it is often

used by Greek writers. And the adjective translated "eternal" in the passage under review, they almost invariably used to express the idea of unending duration. So that Liddell and Scott, who have given to us a Greek lexicon, which for a long period has been regarded as a standard, give to this word only two definitions, "lasting" and "eternal." All really eminent Greek lexicographers define it in the same way. There is not a stronger word in the Greek language with which to express the thought of unending duration. It is used more than a score of times in the New Testament to express the unending bliss of the righteous. Christ not only says the wicked "shall go away into eternal punishment," but also the "righteous into life eternal." Would not the evangelist, wishing to set forth the unending blessedness of the redeemed, naturally have chosen the strongest word in the language for the purpose? When the author of the epistle to the Hebrews wishes to set forth the eternity of God the Spirit, he writes, "The Eternal (*aionios*) Spirit." If there had been any stronger word in the Greek language to express unending duration, would not the writer have employed it? Would he have used a word of doubtful import when he wished to express the eternity of the Spirit? Yet this same word is used again and again to set forth the duration of the punishment of the wicked.

In the Revelation the eternity of God is set forth at least five times by the phrase, made up

of the word in dispute, "forever and ever." Thus an angel "lifted up his hand to heaven and swore by him that liveth forever and ever," who created heaven and earth and sea. If any stronger word could have been found by which the fact of unending duration could have been expressed, it would here have been employed. No doubtful term would have been used to set forth the duration of the life of God. But the same word, the same phrase is used in this same book to set forth the duration of the punishment of the wicked, "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever." And so, at great length, we might go on adding one decisive proof to another.

But we are not in our biblical proof shut up to this class of passages. The eternal punishment of the wicked is taught in language the meaning of which the most critical and captious would not attempt to evade. Christ himself warned men against stumbling into sin. He said that it would be better to cut off a hand or a foot, or to pluck out an eye, if these members of our body should cause us to sin, rather than go unmaimed into hell "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Jesus the embodiment of love and mercy, in a few short sentences, speaks five times of the unquenchable fire, and three times of the never-dying worm. No matter how we may explain the metaphors, the awful fact is repeated again and again that the torment of the lost is unending. The fact is stated so clearly, so unequivocally, that one must either receive it as the

truth, or else reject the teaching of Jesus Christ.

We see, then, that just as God speaks through natural law, he speaks in the Scriptures. We have not two voices, but one, speaking in two different spheres but uttering the same truth.

Yet, it is asked, Is such a doctrine in harmony with the benevolence of God. We have seen that men sin voluntarily. God warns them by the laws of their own being against it, and still more emphatically in the inspired word. He points out to them the fearful consequences of transgression. He opens heaven before them and invites them to enter. He promises them forgiveness for their past transgressions. He entreats them in love to be saved. But they utterly disregard every warning and solicitation. They choose the path of sin; they go voluntarily to their own place. Through the maintenance of God's righteous laws, through the laws of their own being, they suffer. To maintain those laws will manifestly be the highest, broadest benevolence, when we take into our view the whole universe and all of God's creatures. If God should not maintain his own laws, then there would be an end of righteousness, and the whole universe would become one vast hell.

Nor is there any greater difficulty in reconciling future and eternal punishment with the benevolence of God, than in reconciling the sufferings of this present life with his benevolence. And men are usually quite ready to admit that the sufferings of wicked men here are just.

Men sin, and so men suffer. When wicked men go to their own place, they will continue to sin; hence they will justly continue to suffer. If they voluntarily continue to sin forever, they will justly and reasonably suffer forever.

But are men tormented eternally in literal flames, in a lake of fire and brimstone? We do not so understand the Scriptures. Heaven is set before us by material imagery; it is our Father's house in which are many mansions. It is a city of precious stones, with solid gates of pearl, and streets of gold. All the most precious things of the earth are gathered together, and wrought into a resplendent city, in order to give us some faint notion of the ineffable blessedness and joy of the redeemed. So on the other hand we have hell. It is outer darkness, tormenting flame, unquenchable fire, a worm that dies not, a lake of fire and brimstone; the most fearful things are seized upon to represent the suffering and woe of the lost. As men in this life suffer inflictions from without, we need not affirm that no such inflictions are meted out to the lost who go to their own place; but the agonies of hell must be preeminently within the soul. If this removes from the idea of hell much of its grossness, it by no means robs hell of its horror. The most exquisite agony that men suffer now is within the soul. A man might well prefer the pain arising from thrusting his hand into the flame, to the agony of remorse. The never-dying worm

may be never-ending remorse. A material, literal hell, to any reflecting mind, is far less fearful than one whose fires are kindled within the spirit here on earth, and being evermore fed by sin, burn on eternally.

If it be said that this is a dreadful punishment, we answer that sin, which evokes it, is a dreadful evil. Sin has brought upon men all the ills under which they groan. Sin evokes God's wrath; sin swept away the race by flood, and burned up the cities of the plain by fire; sin caused Christ to sweat great drops of blood in Gethsemane, and overwhelmed Him with the agonies of the cross. And it is a false and superficial view of sin, which leads many not only to reject the doctrines of the cross, but also the scriptural doctrine of the future punishment of the wicked.

But the larger part of the race will be saved through Christ. All, both in heathen and Christian lands, who die before they come to the years of understanding are redeemed. More than half of all the generations of men have died in infancy. We must add to these the millions who have believed in Christ. Then the Bible assures us that the day will come when "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." It will not then be necessary for one to say to his neighbor, "Know ye the Lord, for all shall know him, from the least unto the greatest." Then all, or nearly all, the generations of men shall,

in unbroken phalanxes, enter into heaven. So that a great man has said—we give his thought, not his words—that, when the history of redemption shall have been completed, the number of the lost, compared with the innumerable throng of the redeemed, will be like those within the jails of any well-ordered community compared with the entire population without. It is thus that the Scriptures fill us with hope concerning the redemption of the vast majority of mankind that have lived, and shall live on this earth.

PREMILLENARIANISM

PREMILLENARIANISM

All true believers confidently expect that at some future period the nations of the earth will be converted to Christ. But, as to the time when this shall be accomplished, and the means by which the grand result is to be secured, men widely differ. Probably the vast majority of the church expect its achievement during the present dispensation by the preaching of the Gospel, but not a few teach with unusual positiveness, not to say dogmatism, that we are not to anticipate this glorious event before another dispensation has been ushered in, for which the present is simply preparatory. They call that anticipated period the Millennium. During the present era, they affirm, that the world is continually to increase in wickedness until it is ripe for judgment; that the Jews now scattered over the world are to return to Judea and rebuild Jerusalem and its temple; then Christ is to come the second time and take up his abode at Jerusalem. The holy dead are to be raised with glorified bodies, while living believers are to be clothed simply with immortal bodies; the anti-Christian powers are to be destroyed and Satan is to be bound. This earth is to be fitted up for the everlasting home of the redeemed. The Spirit is to be poured out as never before, and

the world converted to Christ. Prophecies like Isaiah 2, 2-3* are to be literally interpreted. Jerusalem and mount Zion are to be exalted, because Christ personally dwells in the one, and on the other. All nations are to hasten thither to behold and acknowledge him as their King.

We have purposely kept back in this brief statement some of the grosser features of this theory, lest it might be supposed that we had caricatured it. It should also be said that the literalists whose views we have endeavored to present, do not agree with one another in minor details; some things that are received by one are rejected by another; but they generally agree, that when the prophets speak of the increase and exaltation of Jerusalem, they mean the city of Jerusalem, and not something which it represents, and that the peoples of the globe will not be converted during the present dispensation.

During the past few years so much zeal has been expended in promulgating these views through the pulpit and the press, that it has become necessary in expounding the Scriptures, to state and refute them. We are also urged to such a course by the fact that many of those who adopt them no longer believe that the world is to

* 2. And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

3. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

be subjugated to Jesus Christ by the preaching of the gospel. In some instances they openly express their contempt for the efforts now being put forth to disciple heathen nations—believing all such efforts to be futile.

Let us then observe, first, that Jerusalem, mount Zion and the Lord's house, in the typical passage above referred to, represent the church of Christ. The language of the prophecies positively forbids their literal interpretation. Things are affirmed of Jerusalem, mount Zion and the Lord's house which could not be naturally predicated of any literal city, mountain, or temple. Perhaps not even the literalist would affirm that what Isaiah and Micah both predict concerning mount Moriah is actually to take place; that it is to be really pushed upward from the crust of the earth, till it becomes the head of the mountains, or until it towers above all the mountains of the earth. But, if this part of the prophecy is ideal, why not the rest? Grant that it is ideal, while the rest is literal, then all nations, like a mighty river, are to flow into Jerusalem, in Palestine, which is a physical impossibility. Look also at a cognate passage, at the close of Zechariah's prophecy, 14: 3-5, 8-11, 16-19. If this is to be literally interpreted, then, the mount of Olives is to be cleft asunder; two veritable rivers are to flow in opposite directions from Jerusalem; mount Moriah is not only to be literally lifted up, but all other mountains of the earth are to sink down into plains, and, under severe penalties, all nations

are to offer bloody sacrifices in Jerusalem. Such an interpretation would be monstrous, reinstating the bloody ritual that Christ abolished; yet it seems to be demanded by the theory of the literalist.

But we notice again, that not only the language of these prophecies, but also the teachings of the New Testament set aside such an interpretation. If inspired apostles plainly speak contrary to these literalists, there is an end of controversy. If we understand them, and their utterances seem to be remarkably clear, they assume as a settled fact, that Jerusalem, mount Zion and the house of God are representative symbols of the church; though a noted writer of the present day declares that "they are not anywhere in the sacred volume declared to stand for it." But it may be, that the beasts and images of Daniel and the trumpets of the Apocalypse so engrossed his attention, that he overlooked the simpler, clearer declarations of Paul and James. The former, writing to the Galatians, and evidently having no fear of being misunderstood even by those unsophisticated Gentile believers, speaks of Jerusalem which is above, that was free from the bondage of the law to which Jerusalem then existing was subject, and also declares her to be the mother of us all. Is not this the church of Christ, in which the divine Spirit dwells, and that brings forth children begotten from above by the Spirit? In entire harmony with this exposition, the apostle at the close of his epistle, invokes mercy on the Israel of God.

The author of the epistle to the Hebrews, writing to Jewish converts, who, under the pressure of persecution, were tempted to forsake their profession for their former Judaism, assured them, that while the former dispensation had its Sinai with its flame, and blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; the present dispensation has its mount Zion, and the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and he distinctly declared, that to this mount they had already come. Nor ought we to overlook the obvious reference of Paul to the temple, when he wrote to his brethren of Ephesus that they were "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." He instructed the Corinthians, also, that they were the temple of the living God, and that the Holy Spirit dwelt in them. Peter is still more specific. He calls believers living stones, of which is built up a spiritual house, and this house is an holy priesthood, that offers up spiritual sacrifices which are acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ. This language is too clearly linked with the temple of the Old Testament, with its indwelling Shekinah, to be mistaken. It assumes that the temple with its Shekinah is the symbol of believers as a body;

it assumes this as if it were a most common and familiar thought of the apostolic church; and this is evidence, vastly stronger than if the New Testament had declared it in the most formal, explicit manner.

But James is not a whit behind the very chief of the apostles in his testimony on this point. When the church at Jerusalem, with its elders, assembled to confer with the apostles as to whether circumcision should be required of the Gentile converts of Antioch, James arose and addressed the assembly. He referred to a speech of Peter's; — "Simeon," said he, "hath declared how God, at the first, did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name, and to this agree the words of the prophets." He uses the plural, as though several of the prophets had spoken in like manner; yet quotes only one, as a specimen of the whole. "After this I will return and will build again, or rebuild the tabernacle or house of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up; that the residue of men, others than the Jews, might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." Acts 15:16-17. James not only understood Amos' words as fulfilled under the present dispensation, but also that the conversion of the Gentiles was the rebuilding of David's house, which began with Christ and his disciples. Both converted Jews and Gentiles were the material of which this

house was composed. Its grandeur will culminate when all peoples are gathered into it. Both Amos and James, then—the former under the old, the latter under the new, dispensation—meant by the tabernacle, or house of David, the church of Christ. But the Premillenarians say that it never means that. There is evidently a mistake somewhere.

It is equally clear, also, from the spirituality of the present dispensation, that these prophecies will not admit of a literal interpretation. There has been a progress during the history of redemption, from that which was gross and sensuous, to that which is more spiritual. We see this when we compare the different epochs of miracles. Those, in the time of Moses, were mainly retributive, and wrought in the material and animal creations. In the day of Elijah and Elisha, a majority of miracles were beneficent, and a greater number were wrought in the persons of men, than in the time of Israel's lawgiver; but Christ's miracles were all beneficent, except, perhaps, in a single instance, the withering of the fig-tree; most of them were miracles of healing; many of them were double, the outward and physical healing being only the symbol of the inward and spiritual. When he said to the leper, "Be thou clean," the leprosy of both body and soul was removed; when he opened men's physical eyes, he sometimes also granted spiritual sight. But he taught his disciples that they should work mightier miracles than he did—miracles wholly removed from the

physical world, because he went to the Father. The Spirit being poured out as the result of his exaltation, they, by the preaching of the Word, should be instrumental in repeating throughout the world and in all ages, that chief of miracles—the renewal of the carnal heart. Thus, that which began in wrath in the material world, culminated in mercy within the domain of man's spirit.

We see progress of the same kind in worship. Under the old dispensation, God visibly revealed himself to men in a cloud or pillar of fire, or in the Shekinah over the mercy-seat. He commanded his worshippers to approach him with bloody sacrifices, to burn portions of them and to feast on the remainder. Blood was to be sprinkled on the altar or to be poured over its sides. The outer court of the tabernacle or temple must have presented a scene as repulsive as a slaughter-house.

But when Christ came, these grosser forms of worship passed away. Sacrifices were no longer needed since their antitype had put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Jehovah no longer dwelt within the temple at Jerusalem, but took up his abode in every contrite heart. Worship still has its forms, but when they are in harmony with the spirit of the New Testament, they are outwardly simple and unimposing. No oblation is required except obedience and praise. The true worshipper worships in spirit and in truth. How vast the progress towards the spiritual since the day

when Jehovah dwelt in curtains on the brow of Moriah, and Jewish altars streamed with blood and smoked with consuming flesh! If now we are to interpret the prophecies concerning Jerusalem and mount Zion literally, men are destined to leave the spiritual, to which we have attained, and go back to the material and sensuous. Christ, who is now exalted and glorified, is to dwell once more on Moriah; worship is to be localized. The nations are to go up to Jerusalem to gaze on the form of their King. Instead of advancing, the world is to go back to Judaism. If we follow the interpretation of the Premillenarians there seems to be no escape from this conclusion.

If it is asked, why such imagery was employed by the prophets to express the fact of the increase of the church, a tyro in scriptural knowledge might answer,—It was the only language that a Jew could understand. Jerusalem with its temple was the central point of his theocracy. The law went forth from Jehovah who dwelt there. From the Holy of Holies proceeded the power that overthrew the enemies of his nation. To represent the mount around which the hopes of Israel clustered, as exalted above all others, at least expressed to the Jew, the absolute supremacy of his people; to represent all nations as flowing unto it, expressed their willing subjection to Jehovah, his creator and lawgiver, whose presence was all that made the temple truly glorious. If such imagery did not reveal to his mind the full import of the prophetic message, then nothing

could have revealed it. The difficulty was not, however, in the language employed, but in his spiritual perception, and the position which he occupied in reference to the fulfillment of the prophecy, which lay in the distant future. The language of Isaiah, already quoted, carries us beyond the period of Israel's exclusiveness,—beyond the narrow notions of Jesus's disciples before the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost,—beyond the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple. Guided by inspired apostles, we find that the prophet by this Jewish imagery, has presented to us Christ's church as she will appear some day still in the future. She is to be spiritually exalted. She will become so conspicuous as to attract the attention of men in every quarter of the globe, and all nations like the waters of a broad, deep river shall flow unto her.

We come now to notice, in the second place, that the exaltation of the church and the conversion of the nations of the earth, will take place during the present dispensation. First Isaiah says, "It shall come to pass in the last days." That the same thing is uniformly meant in the Scriptures, by the last days, no careful interpreter will affirm; yet, that it generally designates the present dispensation is unquestionably true. When the dying Jacob blessed his sons, he pointed out that which should befall them in the last days. He seems to have used the words indefinitely, meaning by them simply hereafter; yet in the blessing

pronounced on Judah, the words are seen to include the present era; for the patriarch spoke of Shiloh unto whom the gathering of the people should be. Balaam in his prophecy, Num. 24: 14-19, clearly designates the present era. He saw a star rise out of Jacob and to it dominion was given. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, quoting the substance of a prophecy of Joel, spoke of the present period as the last days. "It shall come to pass in the last days that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh." (Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:17.) The apostle at least, taught that the prophecy then began to be fulfilled. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, that God hath spoken unto us in these last days by his son; the time referred to in these words is too obvious for comment. If the phrase ever has any other meaning in the Scriptures, it is when there is no comparison, in the passage where it occurs, between the past and present dispensations. It then refers, if found in the New Testament, to the closing season of the present era, as when James says, "Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days." There is not a particle of evidence that the words ever designated a period beyond the present. In the Old Testament they almost uniformly refer to the present dispensation as a whole. It then shall come to pass, according to Isaiah, under the present dispensation of the Spirit, that all nations shall press into the church of Christ.

That the world will be converted through the

preaching of the Gospel, during the present era, is taught also, by the general tenor of those prophecies, which portray the increase of the church. That there are some passages which it is difficult to harmonize with this view, perhaps all will admit, but the great mass of scripture which refers to this subject gives a uniform testimony, which impresses ordinary Bible readers with like ideas. That men generally may be mistaken is admitted, but the great body of intelligent and careful scripture readers usually have correct notions of what the Bible teaches concerning a topic like this, in reference to which the testimony is so abundant. The probability is strong that they do not err. When such men read a prophecy (Isa. 9) which declares that a child is born unto us, on whose shoulder rests the divine government, which being administered by him in justice, shall indefinitely increase—that his name is Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace, and that his administration and the promised increase cannot fail because the Lord of Hosts is filled with zeal to secure the ultimate triumph, they naturally conclude, since there is not in the passage the slightest indication to the contrary, that the birth of the King and the increase of his government belong to the same dispensation.

They read of the same Redeemer, coming forth as a branch from the roots of Jesse. (Isa. 11.) The Spirit of the Lord rest upon him. They perceive this to be in harmony with the words of

his forerunner, who declared that the Spirit was given to him without measure. (Jno. 3:34.) He overcomes his foes, and the final result is, that universal peace reigns on the earth, which is "full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Plain readers, possessing ordinary common sense, are led to suppose that, as the branch shooting out of Jacob's roots, is the beginning of the present dispensation, the earth filled with the knowledge of the Lord, will be its close. And when they find Paul quoting from the same prophecy in his Epistle to the Romans, and showing the beginning of its fulfillment in his day, they are confirmed in their conclusion, for they perceive that he knew no dispensation after the present one, in which the nations are to be converted.

Christ is again presented to them as the leader of the people. He shall call and Gentile nations that knew him not shall run unto him. (Isa. 55.) However incredible this may appear to man, the prophet declares it to be possible with God, for his thoughts are not as our thoughts, and the word that goes forth from his mouth shall not return unto him void, but will certainly accomplish his purpose. The result shall be great joy and peace among the inhabitants of the earth. Their inward joy will become seemingly an outward reality, so that the mountains and the hills shall break forth into singing and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Yet, in this prophecy, thirsting men are invited to the waters

of life. The unbelieving are warned to seek the Lord while he may be found, and on condition of obedience are assured of mercy and pardon. These things belong to the present dispensation; then why wrench the glorious result from its natural connection and transfer it to some future dispensation? That is what a common reader cannot understand.

The same Jesus who is represented in the deepest humiliation, is presented almost in the same breath as sprinkling, purifying many nations. (Isa. 53.) He makes his soul an offering for sin and the necessary result is at once depicted by the prophet. He sees the fruit of his sufferings and is satisfied. He justifies many and, victorious over sin and Satan, divides the spoil snatched from his foes. The Father says to Christ, begotten by his resurrection from the dead, and set on the Holy Hill of Zion, "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." (Ps. 2.) "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea and from the river unto the ends of the earth." (Ps. 72.) "For from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen." (Mal. 1.) This language clearly refers to the present dispensation; it is so decisive upon any fair interpretation of it, that if any man declares that

it describes a period after the general resurrection, he is bound to clear his assertion of every reasonable doubt.

The New Testament is not so abundant in its testimony on this subject. Its writers received the Old Testament as God's word, and hence there was no necessity of augmenting evidence already so copious. It assumes the truth for which we contend. Its testimony, therefore, to a considerable extent, is incidental, but all the stronger on that account.

Would not any one naturally infer from the Lord's Prayer, that he expected the conversion of the world during the dispensation that he inaugurated? He taught his disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." As this petition is intertwisted with others which can refer only to the present, and as Christ taught his followers to expect immediate answers to their prayers, saying, "Every one that asketh receiveth," the learner could not fail to understand that his Lord intended to teach that in answer to prayer, the kingdom of God would come during the present era. This impression would be deepened by Christ's last discourse before his crucifixion, in which he promised the Spirit to convince or convict the world of sin, and assured his disciples, that whatsoever they asked in his name, should be granted to them.

The impression made by his prayer is strengthened by his parables. He represented the humble beginning of his kingdom by the mustard seed,

whose branches, when it is grown, furnish a retreat for the birds of the air. So his kingdom, at the beginning apparently insignificant, despised by men, shall in its maturity furnish grateful shelter for the nations. The literalist has been troubled with this parable, and has gravely taught, that the birds in the branches of the mustard tree, were unclean birds, representing the corruptions which creep into the church. This is a case of such rank, special pleading in interpretation, that to state it is to refute it.

Christ also represents the hidden power within his kingdom, which causes its outward growth, by the leaven in the meal. As the leaven extends its influence from particle to particle, till the whole mass is permeated, so the power of the Gospel extends from heart to heart, until all nations are brought under its sway. Its working may not always be apparent, but it is aggressive and real. The kingdom of God will come, yet not by observation. But to avoid the manifest and cogent teaching of this parable, the Premillenarians tell us that leaven represents corruption. So it does often, yet such a thought is inadmissible here. When the leaven of the Pharisees is mentioned, it is the symbol of hypocrisy. This, Christ carefully states. But when he says, the kingdom of Heaven is like leaven, it is most unnatural to suppose that, without any explanation, he represents by it the corruptions of the church. The only point of comparison is between the silent, pervasive power of the leaven and that of the truth of the Gospel.

But if this testimony is not sufficient to convince the most incredulous, there remains still stronger. Jesus, when the shadow of his cross began to fall upon him, said, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." "This he said," writes John, "signifying what death he should die." Perhaps he included in the words, not only the manner of his death on a cross, but also the lifting of him up through the preaching of the Gospel before all nations, as the crucified Redeemer; as Paul wrote to the Galatians, "Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you." But whatever breadth of meaning may be legitimately found in the words, they teach that Christ by his death is to secure the allegiance of the nations. The declaration is most sweeping and clear. The thought is not presented in symbol or poetry, but in the plainest prose. It sounds as though Christ, already coming into the presence of his inscrutable woe, condensed into one utterance, all the declarations of the old prophets concerning the coming glory of his reign. His words can only refer to this dispensation, of which he was the bright and morning star. He does not say, when I come the second time to judge the world, but, if I be lifted up on the cross, I will draw all men unto me. From the very point of my supposed defeat, shall proceed my complete, my universal triumph.

In suggestive harmony with these words pronounced before his crucifixion, after his resurrec-

tion, he said to more than five hundred disciples, assembled in Galilee, "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I commanded you. And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Did Jesus awaken false expectations in his followers? Did he send his disciples on a bootless errand? Did he straightly command them to disciple all nations when he knew that by the use of the means put into their hands no such result was to be reached? Perish the thought! This last command of Jesus blazes like a sun amid his utterances, revealing in the clearest light, what he expected would be achieved by the preaching of the truth. Within its light all Premillenarian interpretations of unfulfilled prophecy, of the meaning of images, horns, trumpets and beasts, are quenched like tapers amid the dazzling splendor of noonday.

As Christ taught, so taught the apostles, whom he inspired. A passage in the prophecy of Joel predicts a vast increase of the Church. A noted writer of our day says, that it is to be fulfilled after the second advent of Christ. Peter at Pentecost said, that it was fulfilled then. Whom shall we follow? An inspired apostle, or an uninspired, self-sufficient man? When the Jews at Antioch, in Pisidia, rejected Paul's message, he said, "Lo, we turn to the Gentiles, for so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be

a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth." (Isa. 49: 6, Acts 13: 47.) The apostle quotes from a passage of Isaiah, which represents kings and princes worshipping the Lord, and men from the most distant parts of the earth flocking into the church. No impartial reader could fail to see that Paul supposed that the prophecy was already beginning to be fulfilled, and that it referred only to the present era. Is it not safe to follow Paul? In the eleventh of Romans, he declares that Israel will continue in her present blindness only "Until the fulness of the Gentiles comes in," and then the Jews shall receive the Gospel. So all Israel shall be saved. He represents that the converted Jews will become most important agents in saving the Gentile world. There is not a hint dropped by him that this is to take place under some future dispensation. His entire language only finds a natural explanation in referring it to the present era. It cannot, without great violence, have any other reference. It is clear that he knew nothing of the views to which we object. How admirably his prophecy harmonizes with the present condition of the Jews, scattered throughout all nations. Why have they not amalgamated with the nations? Has God kept them distinct in order to lead them back to Judea, where they may build their temple and attempt to restore an abolished ritual? Is it not a grander thought, and one more in consonance with the spirit of the Gospel, to say, with Paul, that they are finally to be

brought into the church of Christ, and then, in every nation, whither they have been scattered, and where God has kept them distinct, they are to proclaim, with unwonted zeal, the Messiah, whom they have so long rejected. This they could do, without the labor of learning foreign languages, for, as a people, they have all languages. They have amassed, with a cunning and intrigue, which seems to have flowed down to them from their father Jacob, vast wealth. But their own scriptures declare that the gold and silver are the Lord's, and, at last, they will be poured into his treasury. This predicted ministry will be to the Gentiles, says Paul, life from the dead.

With this agrees the Revelation. John, in his vision, heard voices in Heaven, before the scene of the Judgment was unveiled, saying, "The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." (Rev. 11: 15.)

This direct testimony of Scripture is confirmed by the fact that the church is presented to us in the prophecies as a development. Christ is its central figure and around him as Prophet, and Priest, and King, his followers are gathered. He is first despised, then greatly honored. His subjects are few at the beginning, at last all nations bow to his sceptre.

In these prophetic pictures of his unfolding kingdom, there is no intimation that his universal sway is separated from the beginning of his work by any great convulsion like that which must at-

tend his second coming. Its development seems to be as uninterrupted as the unfolding of a bud into the flower and the fruit. Yet these same prophecies do distinctly announce the beginning of the present dispensation. They disclose the birth and death of Christ, proclaim his fore-runner, and the abolition of the rites of the first dispensation. But the ushering in of the present era was not attended with such startling phenomena, as are to attend the second coming of Christ. Even the shepherds around Bethlehem would not have known that Christ was born, if the angels had not announced it to them. But when Christ comes for judgment, it will be with ten thousand of angels and with the sound of a trumpet, and every eye shall see him. If then the conversion of all nations, which these prophecies announce, is to succeed the second coming, would not that event have been pointed out? If the birth of Christ was foretold by Israel's prophets, would not his second coming have been announced, which, according to the Premillenarians, is alone to secure that for which he laid down his life?

Moreover, we must not fail to notice, that this predicted increase of the church has in part taken place. Notwithstanding the church has contended with manifold corruptions within her own bosom, and has breasted a storm of hurtling arrows from without during almost every step of her progress, yet Christ's promise has proved true in the past, as it will in the future, that the "gates of Hell shall not prevail against her."

She has grappled with every form of opposition, and her pathway has often been crimsoned with the blood of her martyrs, yet she is mightier to-day than ever before. She never was so full of hope—never so confident of success, as at the present hour. If these prophecies of her increase and power have been fulfilled in part, shall we not receive this as the earnest of the future, as the first ripe ears of her universal harvest?

With this increase of numbers and expansion of power, there has been also a development of doctrine. The sacred Canon closed, as to its letter, with the Apocalypse. To it no one is to add, from it no one is to subtract; but he has read the history of the church to little purpose, who has not discovered a constant unfolding of the hidden meaning of scripture so that the written word has adjusted itself with marvelous facility to every new phase of civilization. The doctrines of God's word are correlated with our race. Development in the one, has been speedily registered in the life of the other. Every new conception or phase of doctrine has soon been reproduced in society. So that the church in the past, through the unfolding energy of her doctrines, has sooner or later freed herself from accumulated corruptions to enter with new and greater power on her sublime mission of saving a world. The reformation of the sixteenth century taught the world, for the first time, what hidden might had slumbered in the doctrine of justification by faith. The reformation of 1740 in our own land, sprung up amid

churches that had been corrupted by an unregenerated membership, so that when Whitefield preached that men must be born again, he seemed to be uttering new and startling truth to the gathering multitudes, and the church was then made to feel as never before, the inherent power of the doctrine of the new birth. Is this development to cease? Has doctrine reached the limit of its power? Will it from this time fail to adjust itself to the unfolding exigencies of the nations? Has God's truth, like a frail taper, burned itself out, so that the predicted increase of the church will cease, and the nations wax worse and worse, until a new dispensation has been inaugurated? The notion is monstrous! This development is God's onward march to the final redemption of all nations.

It is however objected, that the Scriptures teach that in the last days of the present dispensation, universal corruption will prevail. Though the passages usually adduced as teaching this are but few, yet our time will not permit any extended analysis of them, and if we were able to present the keenest and most exhaustive analysis, it might be of little or no value, since some of the passages are unfulfilled prophecies of such a nature as to baffle the most penetrating interpreter. Every wise expositor in such a case will regard his conclusions as somewhat problematical; yet it may not be amiss to hint briefly at some principles which ought to guide us in reference to the passages referred to.

1. It is an acknowledged law of interpretation, and also the dictate of good sense, that the few are to be expounded in harmony with the many. We have seen that a very large majority of the passages that refer to the conversion of the world teach that it is to take place during the present era. If a few do not seem to harmonize with such a conclusion, they by no means invalidate it. If we cannot interpret them in harmony with the general sweep of prophecy, we must conclude that we do not yet understand them. New truths are being evolved from God's word, by the conflicts and experiences of God's people, and by the teachings of the Spirit, and these passages may belong to those things which we know not now, but shall know hereafter.

2. If scriptural testimony seems to be as to quantity about equally divided, that which is clear and unmistakable must take precedence of that which is enigmatical and doubtful. Such a declaration as that of Christ, that being crucified he will draw all men unto him, which is so plain, that the wayfaring man, though he were a fool, could not err concerning it, ought to have vastly greater weight in determining what is to take place through the preaching of the Gospel, than the prophecy of Paul concerning the man of sin, that no one yet understands, or probably can understand.

3. We must carefully discriminate between individual and universal corruption. Some passages which disclose only the former have often

been said to teach the latter. Individual wickedness, doubtless, reaches a height under the light and influence of the Gospel, which is not seen in any other condition in which man may be placed. The Gospel is the occasion of this development; it stirs up the indwelling depravity of the soul, and, unless the individual yields to the power of divine truth, an increase in his impiety is the inevitable consequence. Paul, in his epistles, often recognizes, and sometimes broadly states this truth. We feel its presence in almost every portion of the New Testament. It is presented in the "Parable of the Tares of the Field." There will be at the end of the world both wheat and tares; which shall predominate, is no part of the object of this parable to teach, though in the natural world wheat usually does, but as the wheat is developed, so are the tares—as one ripens for the garner, the other matures for the flames. So as men are developed in holiness, those who reject Christ, will unfold in wickedness. This parable does not teach, as is often said, the prevalence of universal corruption at the end of the world; it teaches only individual corruption.

So, also, Paul urges Timothy (2 Tim., iii:1) to faithfulness in his ministerial duties, and then, by way of warning, says: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come." He then portrays by single words, a long catalogue of sins which will be exhibited in men. The apostle is here evidently speaking of the present dispensation as a whole, which he styles the last days.

The godless men of which he spoke, were already in existence for he commanded Timothy to turn away from them. He declared that as Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses, so those men, at that time, resisted the truth, but that as their characters shall be fully manifested by their deeds, they shall "proceed no further" in their iniquity. The apostle does not teach the universal corruption of the race at the close of this dispensation, but, rather, that malignant, individual impiety which is developed in those that oppose the Gospel. Such men are often found in communities where believers decidedly predominate.

4. We must also bear in mind, that the coming of Christ to destroy Jerusalem was announced by the great teacher himself, and with great warmth and particularity pressed upon the attention of the disciples. This event is, indeed, a symbol of the second coming of Christ; words which predicted the one event, also foretell the other. Yet, it seems to be clear that we are not to expect an exact counterpart, at the second coming, of all the details in the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem. Only the great outlines —the prominent features of the earlier event— will be reproduced in the latter.

5. We are not to expect, as we have already intimated, that every individual of the race will be regenerated,—only that the Gospel will decidedly bear sway; Jesus will be acknowledged King in Zion; probably for a long period, none will openly oppose the Gospel; as Moses, in his

song of triumph at the Red Sea, declared that before the display of God's power the heathen should be still as a stone, while Israel marched into the promised land, so shall it be throughout the earth before Christ comes to lead his ransomed hosts into their everlasting rest. But since conversion does not utterly uproot the depraved nature of man, each new generation which appears, will likewise be converted by the preaching of the Gospel. Such a view is probably demanded by the Scriptures, and it naturally provides for the apostacy that is seemingly to occur just before the coming of Christ. Thus the Scriptures, announcing that apostacy, are seen to be in no way discordant with the view of the universal prevalence of the Gospel under the present dispensation. By following these suggestions, there is not a passage in the New Testament, which we are now able to understand, that does not find a natural and easy interpretation, which beautifully harmonizes with the general teaching of the Scriptures relative to the subject in hand.

But, it is objected again, that the world is actually growing worse. It is too true that the corruption of men is now most fearful. It is no part of my object to represent the case in a better light than the facts will permit. It is true that wars still desolate the earth, but they are less barbarous than in former times. Then non-combatants in the enemy's country were regarded as foes and without regard to sex or age were ruthlessly slain, now those not under arms are protected

and cared for. Then military prisoners were sold into slavery or put to death, now they are humanely incarcerated and fed. Then the wounded, uncared for, were left to die on the battle-field, now our armies are followed by Christian men and women, who tenderly care for the sick and the dying. Is not that an advance on the past? Slavery, which bound in its chains half the inhabitants of the Roman Empire in the days of the apostles, has nearly disappeared from the earth. Prisons, into which, at that time, the influence of the Gospel never entered, except in the person of incarcerated believers, now are made to feel the transforming touch of Christian love. Criminals are now men to be saved as well as punished. If any man will compare the present criminal code of almost any European nation with that of a century ago, he will see that barbarism is fast disappearing. Persecution, once prevalent, is not now tolerated except to a limited extent, in any nation of the earth. It is in vain to urge that the human heart is unchanged, and that men would persecute now if they had the power, for those statutes and that public opinion that robs them of it, are decisive evidences of a better condition of things. Theological controversies have lost their bitterness, and the various sects of Christendom are working together on many fields for the establishment of Christ's kingdom. The doctrine of religious liberty, as enunciated by Roger Williams, is by degrees gaining a foothold even in the Catholic countries of Europe,

and is planted in every American and English mission on the globe. The work of modern missions began with the opening of the last century. The efforts, though at first feeble, were mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. Each year new mission enterprises have been inaugurated, until the church begins to press hard upon the hosts of darkness. Many of the worst practices of idolatry have already ceased. Whole peoples have been Christianized. Nations, which a few years since shut their gates against the Gospel, now throw them open for its ingress. Even the strongholds of Japan and China and Burma and Madagascar have been carried by Christ's sacramental host. The mother of harlots has been compelled to yield to the power of a comparatively free government, which is the direct product of an open Bible. Christian labor in Christian countries is becoming more thorough and pervasive. As the morning light which gilds the mountain tops, at last streams down into every dark valley and ravine, so the Gospel in our day goes down, as a quickening light, into the darkest dens of vice in our cities. Yet all that has been done by missions in Christian or in heathen lands, is regarded as only a preparatory work. While missionaries have proclaimed the Gospel, they have been studying the religions and character of the heathen, and translating the Bible and religious books into their languages. How can any man face such an array of facts and declare that the world is grow-

ing worse? Are not these providences of God, as well as his word, prophetic of the speedy conversion of our race, by the preaching of his Gospel?

If this does not take place under this dispensation, then the work of the Spirit is, in a great measure, a failure. He could not enter more largely into the Church, in some future dispensation, than he does in this, if scriptural language means anything. He is *poured out* now. This began at Pentecost, and has been repeated often since then. Pentecost more than once has been outdone. Men are now, like Stephen, *filled* with the Spirit. Nothing could be done for the salvation of men that is not done now. The Spirit convicts the world of sin. He regenerates the heart, creates a man anew in Christ Jesus, enters into him and dwells as in a temple, strengthens him in affliction, succors him in temptation, intercedes for him through the desires that he awakens within him. He unfolds to him the truth of Christ, and leads him into all truth. What more could he do? If this will not save the race, then under no possible condition can it be saved, and the eternal Spirit fails in his work.

A writer of our day says, the salvation of mankind will not now take place, because "the result of this experiment" of preaching the Gospel "is the demonstration on a vast and appalling scale, of the utter indisposition of men, spontaneously to return to God, and the hopelessness of their redemption, unless it be under an administration,

in which the great agents that now tempt them to evil, shall be precluded from exerting on them their deluding, maddening power, and the Spirit of God takes exclusive and absolute possession of their hearts.'' In other words, under existing circumstances, the Spirit is unable to perform the task. Such a representation ignores the grand difficulty in the way of man's conversion. Suppose that Satan is shut up in Hell, and that all governments and hierarchies that oppose the Church, with all their concomitant corruptions, are swept out of the way, the carnal heart still remains, which is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So long as it exists there will be allurement to sin, even if there were no demons to suggest temptation from without. A man is tempted, says an apostle, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed. The binding of Satan and the destruction of the anti-Christian powers, will do but little toward the conversion of our race, so long as the depraved human heart remains unchanged.

Moreover, the Spirit does now sometimes convert a man, in the midst of the most corrupting influences, when all the opposing powers of evil are brought to bear against him. He carries forward and completes his salvation in the teeth of the same difficulties. As he does this in one instance, he can do it in another. At each conversion the opposing forces of evil are weakened, and the forces of good are augmented. So that

if the work is dependent on the diminishing of the outward powers of evil, it constantly grows less difficult, and as there are multitudes of genuine conversions each year, even on this ground, the probability of the world's redemption is annually vastly increased. But I will not argue the question on such a basis; it seems little short of blasphemy so to limit the Holy One of Israel. The Almighty will not fail in his work. He knows nothing of difficulties. He can as easily renew a race as a single soul.

But this work on the part of the Church, is preeminently one of faith. The first element of that faith is to believe implicitly what God has promised. He that weakens the faith of God's children in the promised conversion of the world by the preaching of the Gospel, however sincere he may be, to say the least, mischievously blunders. He does something, perhaps much, to hinder the attainment of that glorious result. He also robs the Church of its most sublime idea. There is sublimity in the thought of one who goes forth to subdue nations by the force of arms, but how much more sublime the conception of subjecting them to Christ by simply proclaiming the truth. This is the sublimity of faith. Such a victory is not with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood, but it is more real than that achieved at Waterloo or Gettysburg, because it is dominion gained over the souls of men. It is not a forced and outward subjection, but a glad submission to God. "The ransomed of the Lord shall return,

and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads."

Then the vastness of the work adds almost immeasurably to its grandeur. The schemes of statesmen, for the good of a single nation, are sometimes inspiring. The conception of the martyred president, when he determined to proclaim the emancipation of four millions of slaves and make good his proclamation with blows dealt out by an army of freemen, has awakened the admiration of the whole civilized world. But such a thought, however grand in itself, shrinks into insignificance, beside the conception of Jesus, uttered on some solitary mountain of Galilee, to a handful of followers, who had been gathered from the ranks of the common people,—"Go ye and make disciples of all nations." They were not commanded to proclaim political freedom to any, but to preach a truth, that the most unlettered could understand, which, when received by the millions of the race, will free them from the bondage of sin and make them forevermore spiritual freemen in Christ Jesus.

This work shall be done. The kingdom of Christ, which overlaps all state boundaries and includes within itself all nationalities, shall be triumphantly set up. The nations shall be turned and overturned, until He whose right it is shall reign. Then it shall be seen that even the folly of Babel has been made to praise Christ, for in every language on the earth shall his name be sung, and on every returning Sabbath, the voice of praise shall be heard around the whole globe.

THE SUPREME END OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS

THE SUPREME END OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS

During the past few years, the courses of study, and the methods of teaching in Theological Schools have been sharply criticised. By some college and university presidents, they have been declared antiquated and quite unable to meet the demands of our own day. These able critics have insisted upon certain radical reforms, which if carried into effect, would be not far from revolutionary.

Having spent seventeen of the forty-three years of my public life in teaching Practical Theology, it may not be inappropriate for me, at this semi-centennial of our *alma mater,* to contribute my mite to this important discussion by throwing out, in the rough, some thoughts which have come to me, during the lapse of time, concerning the founding, construction, and administration of theological schools. I enter with diffidence upon such a task, since I call to mind that these schools, in their present form, are the embodiment of the wisdom of those distinguished and consecrated men, who have wrought in theological education with such power and manifest success, both in Europe and America, from the time of the reformation of the sixteenth century till the present hour.

But during these swift-revolving years, the conviction has become deeply rooted in my own mind that our theological schools should be so constructed and administered as to contribute most directly and effectively to the great, central work enjoined in the gospel upon all of Christ's followers, the seeking and saving of the lost. And it is now clear to me that any changes in the theological schools already established should be made in subserviency to this dominant duty.

This was what Christ himself came into this world to do. When he freely granted salvation to a scorned and hated publican, he gave as the all-sufficient explanation of his act, "For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10). And this work, the seeking and saving of the lost, explains every act of Christ that pertains to our race from the time that he emptied himself of his glory until the present hour. It also distinguishes the gospel from all ethnic or race religions. They present to us man in darkness and distress seeking after God; the gospel presents to us God, and God in Christ, seeking after lost men.

But the work of Christ is also that of his followers. They are one with him and are his representatives. He said to his immediate disciples, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you." And he made his work theirs in circumstances the most impressive. He had risen from the dead, and had appeared to all the Apostles;

but now, on some mountain in Galilee, he appeared to above five hundred of his followers at once. It was just before his ascension. The words that he now uttered were among his very last. That circumstance, as well as their weighty import, reveals their transcendent importance. His disciples were not left in doubt in reference to their duty. He commanded them to do a vast but definite work. Assuring them that all authority in heaven and earth had been bestowed upon him, so that they might not for a moment doubt that the great commission which he was about to give them was buttressed by the will of Jehovah, he said, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I commanded you." This, in different phraseology, was enjoining on them the very work that he himself came to do. They were sent by their Lord to seek out the lost in all the nations, and under God to make disciples of them, and so save them from the love of sin and from its power and destructiveness.

This great commission reveals the breadth of thought contained in the term, Salvation. And whenever in this address, I use the word, "Save," or "Salvation," it means not only the beginning of the new life, but also its completion; not simply justification, acquittal through faith, readjustment of our relations to God, but also santification, being made holy. It means not alone the

gracious work begun by the Spirit in the new birth and in conversion, but that work carried on until the believer is transformed into the image of Christ. To effect this, the Lord teaches us in this commission that the disciples made are to be set apart from the world by baptism and instructed in all that he has commanded. So that saving the lost means not simply passing out of death into life, but also the unfolding and perfecting of that life.

Our duty then is clear as the sunlight. Whatever may be our pursuit, if we live in accordance with the divine ideal, all of our acts will wheel into lines, and those lines will converge to a point, and that point will be the seeking and saving of the lost, making disciples of all the nations. If we till the soil, we shall turn the furrow, and reap the matured harvest, for this great end. If we do business of any kind and thereby accumulate wealth, we shall do it for the supreme purpose of saving lost souls. If we devote our lives to medicine, law, teaching, civil engineering, we shall toil in such professions that we may use what we acquire of material things, intellectual power, knowledge, and experience, in rescuing men from sin. If we are indeed Christ's this will be the great work of our lives; all else will be strictly subservient to it. And this law is universal. No Christian is exempt from it. No Christian church has any reason but this for its existence; nor has any Christian school, academy, college, university, or theological seminary.

In New Testament times there sprang up two theological schools in which men were fitted solely for the work of seeking and saving the lost. Over the first Jesus himself presided. The twelve apostles constituted the inner circle of students; while other disciples, including some women, made up the outer circle. Jesus taught them, so far and so fast as they could receive it, all theological doctrine. He set forth all the essential facts pertaining to God and men and to their mutual relations. But every fact was a concrete doctrine, and every doctrine flowered out into duty. He thus furnished his disciples with the truth by the proclamation of which, men everywhere might be saved.

But every work that he required of them, he himself did; and did it before their eyes, that they might not only know what to do, but how to do it. During his entire earthly ministry, which they witnessed and in which they shared, with marvelous self-sacrifice he toiled to save the lost. None were so vile as to lie outside the sphere of his love and sympathy. And then he expressly declared that this was the very purpose for which he came to the earth. That the disciples might not mistake his great mission, he set it forth in three matchless parables, the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, and the lost son. This mission he finally consecrated with his blood. He laid down his life for the lost. And at the close of the three years in which he thus taught his disciples, and enforced his teaching by doing and dying, in his

valedictory address he sent them out to carry on the work which he had begun and into which with so much assiduity he had initiated them. He who made no mistakes, educated the learners that gathered at his feet to do just one thing, to seek and save the lost of all nations.

Over the second school Paul presided. Like his divine Master, he gathered around him a band of young men;—Timothy, Titus, Silvanus, Tychicus, John Mark, Aristarchus, Epaphras and some others. These he instructed in doctrine and duty and breathed into them his own devoted spirit. They accompanied him in his apostolic labors. He sent them to carry forward to completion work that he himself had begun. Constantly before their eyes was their great leader and teacher, whose soul was all on fire to preach to the heathen the unsearchable riches of Christ; in whose ear the divine voice continually rang, "Far hence unto the Gentiles"; who declared that he would not build on another man's foundation, but would preach the gospel where no one else had ever proclaimed it; who did preach it, in spite of manifold and bitter persecutions, in synagogues, in market places, in prison houses, in courts of justice, to Roman soldiers to whom he was chained, and his purpose was to preach it in the then distant Spain. Those young men inspired by the words and acts of such a teacher, must have had the great thought interwoven with every fibre of their being that their work on earth was simply to seek and save the lost.

While these schools, presided over by Jesus and Paul, in all respects cannot be our models now, the motive which controlled them, ought unquestionably to dominate the theological schools of the twentieth century. In them young men should be fitted solely for making disciples of the lost, and training them for effective Christian service.

If we make this the dominant purpose in theological education, where, First, shall we plant our theological schools? Undoubtedly, just where the students can readily reach, and preach the gospel to, many of the lost. For that work to which they have consecrated their entire lives, to some extent must be carried on, side by side, with their theological studies. This is imperative, if, in these students, the passion for saving souls is to be maintained and fanned to a hotter flame.

But the best opportunities for doing a work of such vital importance both to the student and to the lost are found in our greater cities; and if we are intent on founding theological schools which shall contribute most directly and largely to the evangelization of the nations, without a moment's hesitation we shall plant them in the great centers of population.

But keeping clearly in view the great end of theological instruction, in the Second place, how many theological schools shall we found? Will half a dozen in the eastern portion of this great republic fill up the full measure of our duty? There are men in our country from five hundred to two thousand miles away from any theological

school of their own denomination, who believe themselves called of God to the exclusive work of making disciples of the lost, but distance and poverty seem to them insuperable obstacles, precluding their attendance at the far away seminary. Whether their view of the case be correct or not, so at all events they think. And preach the gospel they will, in spite of their lack of preparation.

Now the patronage of colleges and universities always has been largely local. Of this there is ample proof. So, if in their own or in some adjoining commonwealth a theological school were established, they would avail themselves of its advantages. If it is our purpose, just as soon as possible, using all available resources, to seek out and save the lost at home and abroad, shall we not encourage the formation of theological schools in those destitute States, even if such schools were compelled to do their work under discouraging limitations? Would it not hasten the salvation of the world to give some theological education, even though it were not the most comprehensive, to men who will enter upon their life-work without any, unless schools are planted nearer their own doors? Would not even such an education make them far more efficient in the work of saving the lost and in leading and training the churches of which they will inevitably become pastors? This tentative inquiry is forced upon any thoughtful Christian, who makes careful observations in the States west of the Mississippi River.

And in the long run, the multiplication of theological schools, instead of militating against those that are best equipped at the greater centers of population, would rather build them up. Many a young man, waked up intellectually by attending the theological school nearest his own home, would not be satisfied until he had reaped the advantages of the best that could be had, however distant it might be. Perhaps then there is no valid objection to establishing such schools in the far West except a lack of money. Pastors thereby would be rendered more efficient and more of the lost would be sought out and saved.

But if theological schools are organized for the express purpose of securing the salvation of lost men, in the Third place, what students shall we admit to their privileges? By common consent, college graduates of undoubted piety. But there are others, who by some untoward event have had their college course cut short. Still they have read a little Latin and Greek, so that, with a fair apprehension of the thought, they can struggle through a paragraph of Cæsar's Commentaries and of Xenophon's Anabasis. They have acquired the rudiments of pure mathematics, and dipped slightly into natural science, and may be as capable of thorough work in a theological school as some college graduates. So while our standard of admission is rightly and wisely high, impelled to secure as large a number as possible, who are ready to devote all their time and

strength to the work of making disciples of the nations, we are compelled to say, perhaps with a shrug of the shoulders, let these servants of the Lord be admitted and we will do what we can to fit them for their Christlike labor.

But, why, if we are impelled by the supreme motive of saving the lost, and saving the greatest possible number, in the briefest possible time, should we make that the limit? Why should we draw the line there against the admission of all others? Discipline of mind, power to think deeply and clearly, is acquired in a vast variety of ways. Without drill in the schools, some men, like Matthew at the receipt of custom, in meeting the strenuous demands of business, are disciplined to accurate thinking. Some, like Lincoln, acquire the power of thinking clearly by the careful reading of weighty books, and by expressing in accurately written propositions the thought discovered in them, or suggested by them. Some go to school in newspaper offices, and by setting type, or by doing the work of reporters, become able to express their thought correctly, if not elegantly. In fact whenever a man masters any one object of thought, especially if to his thinking he adds the doing of the thing thought out, he thereby acquires the ability to think clearly and justly. Dr. Emmons said, "He is a learned man who understands one subject: and he is a very learned man who understands two subjects." Men disciplined by thinking out and doing some thing or

things well, in some field of every-day life, are sometimes called of God to devote the remainder of their lives exclusively to the work of seeking and saving the lost. They are often so far advanced in age that a college course for them is impracticable; so, just as they are, they come to the theological school, and find written over the door, "None are permitted to enter here except college graduates, or those whose course of study is equivalent to that of the college." Turning away with disappointment and sorrow, they say, "Necessity is laid upon us; preach the gospel we must, even though the theological seminary closes its doors against us." Unaided, at all events by the theological school, they enter on their work of saving men, accomplishing something to be sure, yet always haunted and oppressed with the thought that they might have done vastly more, might have saved more souls from sin and death and hell, if by competent professors they had been piloted through a course of study in the English Bible, Doctrinal Theology, Church History, Homiletics and Pastoral Duties.

If, in building our theological schools, we are controlled by the demand squarely laid upon us by Christ in his great commission, we shall certainly provide for the theological training of such men as these. We cannot, it seems to me, be true representatives of him, who bowed the heavens and came down for the sole purpose of seeking and saving the lost, if, by our refusal to

receive these applicants for theological instruction, we compel them to do their life-work destitute of the equipment that they might and should have had.

But by some of our institutions of highest grade cogent reasons have been urged against receiving them. We are told that the classes in theology must be fairly graded in order that the students may be stimulated to do their best work. Those most thoroughly disciplined should not be retarded in their progress by those who are unable, at least in the same time, to master fairly the subjects under discussion. It is necessary, therefore, to divide and suitably classify students differing widely in their degrees of culture. But if all were admitted to the same school and suitably classified the amount of teaching required would be nearly doubled. A burden so great could not be borne by the faculty of instruction. But this formidable objection can be fully met by increasing both the number of instructors, and the moneyed endowments.

But some have gone so far as to maintain that even the presence of non-college graduates on the grounds and under the roof of a first-class theological school tends to lower the standard of scholarship and to bring the institution into disrepute. While we have no real sympathy with this objection, and believe it to be quite baseless, yet admitting it as at least a prejudice to be humored, this seeming difficulty can be overcome by establishing other theological schools so far

away that the institutions of higher grade could not possibly be affected by them for weal or for woe.

In such an institution students who have not had the advantages of the college could be educated not only for the pulpit and pastorate, but also for the work of the colporter, the Bible-class teacher, and Sunday-school superintendent, and women might also there be fitted for diaconal service and missionary labor. At all events, on one thing we insist, that we cannot in our educational work be true to the great commission, unless somehow and somewhere we do all in our power to give theological instruction and training to all those whom the Lord calls to the exclusive work of making disciples of the lost, whether they be graduates of college or not.

In the earlier history of our own denomination in this country, most of our churches were planted and trained by men who never received a college education. Many of them were effective preachers. Some of them, like John Leland and Alfred Bennett, were men of rare eloquence, who swayed at will great audiences. It is true that most of the churches to which they ministered, now demand pastors of broader culture, but there are fields almost innumerable both in the East and West whose spiritual necessities would be well met by men destitute of college training, if in some well-ordered theological school they were only carefully instructed in the Scriptures, biblical doctrine, and in the whole round of practical

theology. Many of these students, if not far advanced in years, would probably be stirred up by such instruction to enter upon a broader and more thorough course of study.

While we are sure that in the ministry quality is vastly more important than quantity, all the history of the past teaches us that outside of college walls, we sometimes find men of the finest quality and of the greatest worth. And when we remember the hundreds of millions of our fellow men to whom the gospel has never yet been preached, the tens of millions of formalists who have no saving knowledge of Christ, the fields at home and abroad that are ripe, and that there are but few reapers to gather in the harvest of souls, we cannot but feel how strong and solemn our obligation is to equip as many laborers as possible and send them out without delay on the Christ-like errand of seeking and saving the lost of all the nations.

But, in the Fourth place, in order to fit men for the all-important work of saving the lost, what should be the course of study in our theological schools? In substance, we reply, the same that we now usually find in them; but, it seems to me, if we are to realize our aim, it will be necessary to put greater emphasis on some subjects than we do now, thus quite materially modifying the ordinary curriculum, without any radical displacement of old topics. And it may be wise to require the student to acquaint himself with Sociology and Pedagogy, which of late have been

knocking at the doors of some of our theological schools.

First of all, he, who like his Master, goes forth to seek and save the lost, must have a clear, strong grasp on the message which he is sent to proclaim. And since this message is found alone in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the fundamental subject in the theological curriculum should be the written word of God. These inspired writings should be studied if possible in the language in which they were written. Still a devout and diligent student, through the best translations, can acquire a just and adequate knowledge of the Bible; and, as a matter of fact, most students who study the Scriptures in their original tongues are usually enabled to apprehend their real import as much by the translations to which they properly constantly refer, as by what they independently discover in the Hebrew and Greek texts. But be this as it may, all theological teachers, with entire unanimity, will urge that it is absolutely necessary for him who is called to preach the gospel to lost men, to become in some way thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures whence he derives his message.

But this is a task as difficult as it is important. To help the student fairly to accomplish it what must be his teacher's mode of procedure? There are two ways of teaching the Bible; both are important, and they should be combined. One is to subject some portions of the Scriptures, a scrap

of history or prophecy here, an epistle there, to a careful, painstaking, minute examination, and let this be the model to guide the student and preacher in all his future study of God's word. He goes to his life-work well acquainted with some patches of the Scriptures; to his mind they are luminous spots in a wide, untraversed territory; but working his way out from these he may be able successfully to explore the far greater remainder. There is much good sense in such a method of study, and every student should have the great benefit that manifestly flows from it. But while we hold fast to this, we also maintain that every student, whose sole work in life is to be the proclamation of God's word, should, under the guidance of a competent teacher, investigate as thoroughly as may be every book of the Bible, learn the characteristics of each history, song, prophecy, gospel and epistle, the object for which each was written, and make a general analysis of its thought. Having thus surveyed the whole, he will better understand and more keenly appreciate any one of its parts. He gets also through such study a clear view of the ever-unfolding revelation of the character and purposes of God, from the account in Genesis of paradise lost by sin, to the Apocalypse in which are portrayed the ineffable glories of paradise regained through the love and grace of God.

But shall the student be taught higher criticism? Since he must often meet the notions embodied in it, which have been, and are being, so

industriously spread abroad, good sense would dictate that all the essential views, on both sides of this controversy, should be impartially presented, that the student may be able intelligently to judge for himself where the truth lies. He should be warned against all partial, one-sided advocacy; he should be carried back far into the past to the very roots of this movement; should be led to a careful survey of the present opinions of the critics in all their manifold variations and antagonisms; so that whatever of truth there may be in them, he may receive, and whatever of error, he may reject. He should ascertain for himself what in this contention is unsubstantial theory, and what is established fact. From broad candid study like this the truth loses nothing, but gains much.

But what the student needs to know beyond all that higher criticism essays to offer, beyond a knowledge of the literary character of the books of the Bible, their authors, the time when, and the people to whom, they were written, is their actual contents, the divine thought with which they are freighted; since that thought made known to men is the divinely-chosen means by which the lost are to be saved. The superlative emphasis therefore in the curriculum of a theological school should, it seems to me, be laid on the study of the entire word of God.

But since nothing is really known until it is apprehended in its relations, we must give to systematic theology a very prominent, though it be

a subordinate, place in our curriculum. We choose the term, systematic, because so far forth as biblical theology, which happily attracts so much attention at the present time, presents to us the doctrines of the Scriptures in their real and vital relations, it is systematic. These doctrines are not isolated like the scattered stones of the street, but vitally united like the various parts of the body, so that they form a living organism. On the other hand systematic theology includes metaphysical theology, for in so far as we justify the relations in which we present the doctrines of the Bible, we necessarily reveal their philosophical basis; so that the term systematic, virtually includes both biblical and metaphysical theology. Now no one can have a clear, just conception of any one doctrine of the Scriptures, until he apprehends it in its vital relations to other doctrines. To present a truth out of its real relations distorts it, and often transmutes it into insidious, destructive error. Systematic theology which keeps us from such a folly and disaster, which gives a true knowledge of doctrine by revealing it to us in its just relations, is greatly decried in our day. But scientific theology, decried though it be, is absolutely necessary to keep even the preacher, who believes the gospel with all his heart, from one-sidedness and practical heresy.

But a knowledge of church history is also important for him who goes forth from our theological schools to make disciples and to lead them

in all Christian activity. Just as the sculptor or painter, in order to reach the highest excellence in his art, needs to trace its development through all the past centuries, so the ambassador of Christ, in order to do his work most wisely and efficiently, must know what the church has hitherto wrought out both in doctrine and life.

The renowned leaders of the church in all the past centuries arouse young men and spur them on to highest achievement. Its martyrs shame them out of all complaint for any hardships that they may be called upon to endure for Christ's sake. Church history also reveals to the student the great principles that underlie the growth of God's kingdom here on earth, and the onward march of God's providences in the fulfillment of his great purposes of grace to our fallen race. And however many things he may see in all this past history, which he cannot but deplore, he finds that the final outcome vindicates Christ's declaration concerning his church: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And this fills him with confidence in the final triumph of the gospel. History has also preserved the molds of doctrine of the past centuries and these enable him so to express doctrine now as to reflect any new light that has broken forth from God's word. The varied expression of doctrine teaches the student that while one theological formula has been replaced by another, the truth, which successive generations fail to express perfectly, is eternal and immutable. The sermons of successful

preachers, down through the Christian centuries, help him to gauge the real worth of his own discourses, and stimulate him to higher achievement; the prayers of the past crystallized in ritual enrich his own both in thought and expression; the best hymns of the whole Christian era give him a clear conception of what a good hymn is both in matter and poetic form. History also gives to him breadth and liberality. He learns from the doctrinal formulas, sermons, prayers, and hymns of the past nineteen centuries that believers of different epochs, countries, races, civilizations, communions are in substantial accord in reference to most of the central truths of the gospel. Moreover, history lifts a warning voice against extremes or one-sidedness in thought or conduct, by revealing the disasters which unbalanced thinking and acting have brought upon the church. It also takes the conceit out of a learner, by showing him that virtue and knowledge are not peculiar to his own generation, but that large areas of truth were known before he was born. It fits him too to detect and refute the errors by which he may be confronted. He sees that whatever may be said of the transmigration of souls, there is not the slightest doubt of the transmigration of error. That the brand-new arguments by which the gospel is now at last to be utterly overthrown are as old as Celsus, or as musty as Gnosticism—malodorous mummies of scepticism pulled out of their mouldy tombs, and dressed in ninteenth-century clothes. So history helps to

make him what Paul said the pastor must be, "able to convict the gainsayers."

But perhaps the crowning benefit derived from this study is that it shows the student what fools men have made of themselves and into what morasses of difficulties they have plunged whenever they have departed in opinion or life from the simple word of God. And this will be a powerful influence to keep him true to the inspired Scriptures.

But of late it has been seriously contended that Sociology and Pedagogy should have a place in the curricula of our theological schools. It is true that these studies are full of valuable suggestions to any one who toils for the good of his fellow men, but there is nothing in them which distinctively belongs to theological training. Whatever they yield that is valuable is just as necessary for the teacher, the lawyer, or the physician, as for the minister of the gospel; in short, these studies are very desirable factors in the education of every citizen. They manifestly belong therefore not to the theological school, but to the college and the university.

As to the Sociology of the New Testament, that is simply the presentation of the manner in which Christ and his apostles won men to the truth, and laid down the principles by which they should be controlled in all their relations to society and the state. All this should be set forth in any thorough exposition of the Gospels, the Acts and the Epistles. Any student, under the guidance of his

exegetical professors, could easily explore this entire subject; but if the elucidation of this important topic should prove to be too great a burden for our professors of exegesis, then a professor of the Sociology of the Bible should find his place in all the faculties of our theological schools.

Now, still keeping in mind the fact that in the theological school students should be expressly trained for the work of making disciples of the lost and of leading those disciples in all Christian activity, it is unquestionably incumbent upon us to instruct them thoroughly in Pastoral Duties. Much more time and attention should be given to such instruction than has hitherto been required even in our best equipped seminaries. It does not need to be said that the primal duty of a pastor or shepherd is to go after the lost until he finds them; and when, amid the rejoicing of the heavenly host, he has brought them home to God and into the fold, it is his duty to feed them that they may grow in all the graces of the Spirit and become in thought and purpose and life like Christ himself.

Both in making disciples and in building them up into stalwart, Christian manhood, the most prominent instrumentality is preaching. This was divinely instituted. It has been consecrated by prophets, apostles, elders and by Christ himself. It has pleased God through the foolishness of preaching (not by foolish preaching) to save those that believe. Preaching without the shadow

of a doubt is the preëminent duty of every one whose exclusive work is to save the lost. It follows therefore that in the making and delivery of sermons, every student in our theological schools should be carefully taught and thoroughly drilled.

First, he should be taught how to get his message out of God's word, so that that message will be the real thought of God, and not some theory or vagary of his own that he has saddled on his text.

Second, the student must be taught to put the message that he derives from the word of God into language readily understood by those to whom he speaks. Else, if at first they give him their attention, he cannot hold it. Men will not long listen to a speaker whom they cannot understand. A sermon most fitting and impressive addressed to an audience of learned men might be as unintelligible as Chinese to a congregation of American workmen from some manufacturing establishment.

Years ago, in my own pulpit, a distinguished brother and college president preached to a congregation of plain, sensible people, and at the start, endeavoring to elucidate his text, said, "The Greek particle *hina* in this text is illative, and it is here used not in its telic, but in its ecbatic sense!"

While I am sure that no young men from any of our theological schools would be guilty of such gross impropriety, yet they often unwittingly err

by using in their sermons the technical terms of theology. Very useful terms they are to the student, and pregnant with meaning; but they are out of place in the pulpit.

Two squirrels that often come to my chamber window for nuts would be excellent instructors of some preachers. They very quickly push their sharp teeth through the hard shells of the walnuts, and taking out the sweet and nourishing meat eat it with avidity, while they cast the empty and worthless shucks aside. But very few in the average congregation are able to break for themselves the hard, dry shells of scientific theological terms, and the live preacher will do it for them. As he constructs his sermon, he will crack these nuts, and carry to the people the nourishing truth which they contain, but will leave the shucks in his study. No man is fit to preach until he has learned the distinction between a theological treatise and a sermon.

Third, the students of our theological schools, if they are ever to get at, and save, men through preaching, must also learn the distinction between an essay and a sermon; that an essay is a dissertation on some fact, or principle, or doctrine, in which only the third person is used and no one is addressed; while a sermon is a direct address to men, a personal appeal in which, as in Christ's sermon on the mount, the second person inevitably rises to the lips. The preacher says "*you*" to him whom he would save from sin and death. Bulwer in his Caxtoniana says, "The essayist

quietly affirms a proposition; the orator vehemently asks a question. The writer asserts that the 'excesses of Cataline became at last insupportable even to the patience of the Senate.' 'How long will you abuse our patience, O Cataline?' exclaims the orator.''

But fundamental as this distinction is, and necessary as it is to ministerial success, some men in the pulpit, eminent for their talent, seem never to have learned it. A pastor, in the United States, who became famous for his literary attainments, as a preacher had very little success. He read delightful essays, full of sonorous, well-balanced sentences, upon every doctrine and duty of the Bible and upon all its literary beauties. Men listened with the same sort of interest that is manifest in a literary club when some talented member reads a thoughtful essay, and then unmoved went their way. His senior deacon, who for many years ardently supported him, said to me one day, ''My pastor and Peter are exact opposites. Peter preached one sermon and three thousand were converted; but my pastor has preached three thousand sermons and one has been converted.'' But those numerous, so-called sermons were scholarly, brilliant essays, that and no more.

But if we are really educating the students in our schools to make disciples of the lost and to train them in Christian living, they must be taught not only to make sermons, but also to deliver them. A good delivery is often more than half

the battle. A poorer discourse well delivered is often vastly more effective than an abler one poorly delivered. What strange infatuation controls us, when we insist upon efficiency in Hebrew, and Aramaic, and Greek, and history, and theology, and yet at the best pay comparatively so little attention to teaching men how to speak with clearness and force and manliness, while public speaking is to be the most constant and important work of their whole lives. If we appreciate as we ought that the exclusive work of these students in all their future life on earth is to get at men and save them by preaching, we shall give more earnest heed to their training in elocution.

But if we are intent on making disciples of the nations, we shall not only teach the students in theological schools the divine art of preaching, but also the whole round of pastoral duties; how to conduct the service of public prayer so as to stimulate the devotions of the whole congregation; how to read the Scriptures so as to give the sense; how to read hymns so as to reveal their thought; how to administer impressively the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; how to develop the spirit of worship in the congregation through singing; how to guide and stimulate the church in all its benevolences; how to build up the Sunday-school and Bible classes; how to marry the betrothed and bury the dead; how to make effective pastoral calls on all classes; how to reach non-church-goers; how to deal with in-

quirers; how to conduct church discipline; how to get an entire church interested in saving all classes of men, and the community interested in the church and its work. If we really educate men to save the lost, all these duties, which touch at so many points the great and absorbing end in view, must be taught with an iteration and earnestness hitherto unknown.

And the instruction given in these duties should be tested if possible by actual work done, while the student is engaged in his course of study. Let him and his professor, when they have the opportunity, preach and do other pastoral work together. Moreover, it would be of great advantage to the student, either during his course of study or immediately after, to be associated with some aggressive, successful pastor, under whose immediate supervision and direction he shall, for at least a year, give himself to all kinds of pastoral work. And if the graduate is to be a missionary, it would greatly help him in his work, and enhance his effectiveness, if he could toil for two or three years under the guidance of some veteran laborer on the foreign field. In fact the whole work of making disciples at home and abroad should be enthusiastically studied as a divine art, ever bearing in mind, that the process of saving is never complete, till those who are rescued from sin, are presented before the divine throne, "without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing."

We have not discussed the subject of elective

studies because it does not seem to us to be directly involved in the theme under consideration. But any liberty granted in the election of studies should be limited by the great principle which we have endeavored to set forth; the subjects chosen should be such as will best fit the student for the work of making and training disciples.

And if to the studies already named another should be added, it is that of interpretative reading. The public reading of the Scriptures has a prominent place in pulpit service. Paul exhorted Timothy to give special attention to it. To express by reading correctly and forcibly the thought of God as it lies in the inspired writings adds vast power to the public ministrations of any preacher. But this is no easy task. One must first understand the thought of the passage that he wishes to read, and then be able by emphasis and tone to reveal it to, and impress it upon, those that hear. The professor of this art must be skilled both in interpretation and in elocution. And the wretched reading of the Scriptures with which so many congregations are afflicted renders such a professorship imperative.

But if we found and administer the theological school for the sole purpose of seeking and saving the lost, what kind of a faculty of instruction must we have? Upon them more than upon all else, rests the success or failure of the theological school. They are its chosen and acknowledged leaders. What they are, the school will be. Like priest, like people. Like professors to a large extent will

be the students, and the pastors and missionaries educated under their direction.

In answering this question, "What kind of faculty must we have?" some things indeed are taken for granted and need not be insisted on here. Of course, the professor must thoroughly understand what he attempts to teach. How can a man teach what he does not know? He must also have the power so to put before his classes the facts and principles of his subject that they will apprehend them and be impressed by them. In other words he must know the practical art of teaching.

But what the professor himself is, is still more important. Character, from which flows forth influence as silent, constant, pervasive and mighty as the force of gravitation, is the supreme factor to be taken into account in the selection of our theological instructors. By what they are, vastly more than by what they teach, they shape the characters and determine the destinies of the students, who look up to them with trust and often with admiration. No men on earth need more than theological professors to walk with God, and to incorporate into their own characters the character of Christ.

But we must not forget that these professors who have the three qualifications named, a clear apprehension of what they are to teach, aptness in teaching, and characters molded after that of Christ, are called to fit men for the exclusive and all-important work of seeking and saving the

lost. But how can they train others to do this unless they know how to do it themselves? How can a man teach others to swim, if he himself cannot swim? How can one teach others to paint animals, or flowers, or landscapes, or portraits if he himself has never put pencil or brush to canvas? How can a man teach others the art of saving souls, who has himself never practised that art? Our contention is that in a theological school built up for the express purpose of fulfilling the great commission, all of its professors should have, to a greater or less extent, the experience of preachers and pastors; at least they should know by having done it, and by doing it while engaged in teaching, what it is to seek and save the lost.

The introduction of men into our theological faculties who are utterly destitute of all pastoral experience, powerfully tends to supplant the motive which should have absolute control in all theological teaching. Scholarship instead of evangelism, becomes, imperceptibly it may be, but really, the supreme end in teaching. And so it comes to pass that those students are most valued, most generously helped, and most honored, who excel in some special line of investigation, even though their specialty be quite remote from their chosen life-work, the preaching of the gospel. Under such a spur, students become more ambitious to secure the scholastic degree of Ph. D. than to become workmen in the ministry, who need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word

of truth. Many of them become specialists in study and soon leave the work of saving the lost that they may devote themselves exclusively to that of scientific and scholarly attainment. And the result too often is that they leave the throne of the pulpit for some chair of linguistics, or philosophy, or history, in some academy, or college, or university.

In saying this, it is not my purpose to disparage in the slightest degree the broadest, profoundest scholarship; unquestionably the more the preacher has of it, other things being equal, the more effective he will be. We are sure that neither God nor sensible men take any delight in ignorance. But it is not the object of the genuine theological school to make its students profound specialists in any department of thought,—to produce that somewhat indefinite creature called a scholar; but rather to train men for the specific work of preaching the gospel and saving the lost.

But having organized our theological schools for the express purpose of securing as soon as possible the salvation of all men, can we adequately equip and endow them? They should have buildings and libraries and a suitable number of professors, who will be expected to devote all their time and energies to the task of training the students for the matchless work to which God has called them. Most of these teachers are poor and must receive just compensation for their toil. And we are commanded "not to muzzle the ox

that treadeth out the corn." So our schools should have a sufficient income from invested funds to sustain these instructors not in luxury, but, at least, in decency.

How can adequate endowments be secured? If all in our churches were fully alive to the great fact that their supreme work on earth is to seek and save the lost, then our thrifty and rich laymen would see in our theological schools such a mighty agency for carrying out the great commission, that they would clamor for the privilege of suitably endowing them. But alas! up to the present hour, only a few, compared with the great body of believers, have ever apprehended the fact that the only adequate reason for the existence of any Christian church is the seeking and saving of the lost. Not apprehending this, hosts of Christian men are accumulating wealth simply for themselves and their households. It has never dawned upon them that they are under God merely stewards of the wealth which they have gathered; that both they and it belong to the Lord; that he rightly claims it together with their talent and energies for the work of rescuing men from sin and death. But will they always fail to see that the responsibility of saving the lost rests just as squarely on the laity as on the ministry, on the pew as on the pulpit? And these business men in the churches, what great talent they possess! Many of them are thrifty farmers, or builders, or merchants. They are prominent among those who originate vast enterprises and

successfully carry them out. They rib the continent with steel rails; they thread the face of all civilized lands with telegraph wires; under the mighty oceans they stretch their electric cables; their ships furrow all waters around the whole globe; but all this talent belongs to Christ, and should be concentrated on the great work which he has called us to do, making disciples of all the nations.

And we believe that the time will come when Christian business men of all denominations will see their duty and do it. There will then be another ecumenical council somewhat different from that recently held in New York. In addition to Christian pastors, missionaries, and missionary secretaries, there will be a far greater host of Christian laymen, many of them having great wealth. And they will say to each other, "The Lord has left us a mighty work to do. He has commanded us to seek and save the lost of all nations; it is passing strange that we have not before this seen our duty; now let us set about the doing of it. We have the requisite money, and we will use it for this great purpose. Our ships shall not only carry merchandise, but truth and salvation to the ends of the earth. Our ocean cables shall not only report the price of corn and cotton and stocks on foreign bourses, the twists of diplomacy at the national capitals, the carnage of battle-fields, and the desolation wrought by famine and pestilence, but also the conflicts and triumphs of the gospel of Christ in every part of the earth."

That great council will be irenic. Denominational differences will be utilized simply in helping map out the work to be done. One part of the earth will be given to one denomination to evangelize, another part to another, until the whole globe shall be marked out into districts, each of which will be invaded and conquered by some one of the divisions of God's sacramental host. Then, this council will see as never before the need of very many scholarly, devoted, consecrated missionaries, and they will wisely conclude to endow amply our theological schools as the most important of all the means by which this great demand can be met. Till then we must look up enough men and women, who, in some measure, at least, understand what the great work of the Church of Christ on earth is, and get them to endow, as well as may be, these theological schools. And just in proportion as the great mass of Christ's followers see and feel that their chief work is to make disciples of all the nations, will be the ease with which these endowments can be secured.

Now what is the conclusion of the whole matter? First, a theological school planted, endowed, and conducted under the sway of a motive so lofty and mighty as this, would attract to its halls a large number of students. The highest, noblest manhood is always most aroused and attracted by work which is difficult, but at the same time immeasurably important. True men are seldom responsive to any call to do what is easy and of

little worth. But if our liberties are brought into jeopardy, if our hearths and homes are threatened with destruction, then all true men rush to the rescue regardless of personal ease or safety. If our fellow men are in peril from flood, or fire, or fell disease, men and women without a thought of the hardships and imminent dangers that confront them, hasten to bring relief. And so when it shall be known that a theological school has been planted and is being administered to fit men solely for the difficult, heroic work of saving the lost throughout the whole world, a work which brings men into fellowship with God and into conformity with his character, a work which not only regenerates individuals, but on the principles of righteousness transforms society and reconstructs laws and governments, a work that is the only reasonable hope of all that is purest and most beneficent in civilization, young men in all the churches of Christ will be aroused as by the trump of God, and will say, "There we must go, that we may be fitted to do this great thing."

Second, this imperial motive will also secure on the part of the students thus drawn together faithfulness and enthusiasm in study. They will gladly subject themselves to the most rigorous discipline, since, thereby they will be better fitted to save men, to enter more efficiently into the very work to which Christ with such complete self-sacrifice consecrated his earthly ministry; this, if anything, will secure untiring devotion to study.

Third, such a theological school will become a center of evangelizing power. That to which the congregated students consecrate their lives, will, as opportunity presents itself, be at once begun. The saving of men will not be a mere theory, floating in the brain during the period devoted to theological study, but, from the start, theory and practice will go hand in hand. So far as time will permit, without trenching on the necessary work of the study and class-room, these students will put forth earnest effort to seek and save the lost. The truth discovered and intellectually grasped, will at once be applied and tested in the work of saving souls. Just as the student of Chemistry masters its principles and theories by experimenting in the laboratory, so the student of theology will be helped to the mastery of its truths by applying them in the real work of saving men. The great joy which flows from the acquisition of new truth, will be supplemented by the greater joy which flows from saving the lost.

From this it is clear that such labor will not interfere with rapidity and thoroughness of acquisition. The one will rather stimulate and help the other. The practical test of truth, by its application to real life, will give the student a clearer, firmer grasp of it.

And if any student should at times fall into doubt concerning the truth or efficiency of the gospel, nothing so quickly and completely sweeps away the gathering clouds of unbelief as witness-

ing the transformation of men, through the proclamation of the truth.

Moreover, truth acquired both by study and by testing its power in real life gives to the student steadiness and firmness of faith. He knows what he believes. The truth to him is not some intangible theological theory or speculation, but part and parcel of his experience and life. And when he speaks, he utters what he has seen and felt. To him the doctrines of God's saving grace are as solid as a mountain of granite; and when he preaches them you hear in every sentence the accent of conviction.

And to crown all, the students of such a school, already, as time and opportunity permit, engaged in the work of saving the lost, will never need to be stirred up from without to labor on the foreign mission field, but they will always be ready to toil among, and for the salvation of, any people on the face of the earth. Whenever the call comes from any place, at home or abroad, each one with glad heart will say, "Here am I, Lord, send me."

Fourth, this mighty motive which we have considered would vastly augment the power of the professors of the theological school. How diligent they would become, how earnest and painstaking in study, how faithful and patient in teaching, if, in every hour of their lives, they felt that they were doing all their work in order to secure as soon as possible the salvation of the lost for whom their Master died.

And this motive would not only lead them gladly to give to their work every power of body and soul, but it would also modify and shape their teaching. Under its influence they would be constrained to present to the students under their care, and to lead them to investigate and acquire just what will help them most in saving lost men and in training them for the broadest and most effective service. They would be led to discard in teaching that which is merely speculative, however interesting in and of itself it might be. Without undervaluing tentative speculation, they would in all probability be forced to the conclusion, that many truths of the gospel have been already over-discussed; that its great saving truths are established beyond all reasonable doubt, and that they should spend their time and strength in teaching the everlasting verities of God's word, so necessary to fit the young men of their classes to do the work of making disciples of the lost. At all events, the mighty motive that controlled Christ in all that he said and did, would be the great decisive factor as to what they should teach, and as to the emphasis that they should give in teaching to this or to that.

How much time some theological teachers have given to the speculation as to whether there may be a second probation, as to whether men who die in impenitence may have another chance to receive or reject salvation on the other side of the grave. Of course the whole sweep of Scripture is utterly against such a view. There are only

two or three vague hints in the Bible out of which such a doctrine might be tortured. How shadowy is the basis of such a speculation, resting as it does on the most perverse atomistic interpretation. And how can such hypothetical, unsubstantial teaching concerning the future life fit men to seek and save the lost now and here?

This indeed may be an extreme case. But if theological professors, in all their teaching, have alone in view the fitting of men to save the lost, very likely a multitude of speculations, on a large variety of topics, on which much precious time has been worse than squandered, will be altogether laid aside and forgotten.

Moreover, controlled by the supreme motive of saving the lost, theological professors will not hesitate to take right hold of this practical work along with their students. Not of course to the extent of interfering with that study, which is so imperative, if they are to be strong, successful teachers; but some practical labor of this kind will keep them constantly in mind of the great work that the Master demands alike of teachers and pupils, and will make the gospel which they unfold to their students a greater power within their own souls. I take it for granted, that no man, be he layman, or minister, or theological professor, can teach the gospel only so far forth as he *does* the gospel. Christ said that we must not only hear his sayings, but do them.

How inspiring would be the sight of a theological school animated with, and unified by, this

great truth, that Christ's disciples have only one reason for living and acting, and that is to save the lost. For this great end the professors would study, and teach, and preach and pray; for the same great end the students would read, and investigate, and eagerly listen in the lecture-room, and also pray; and all, both teachers and students, so far as their strength should permit, would join hands in the practical work of seeking and saving the lost. How blessed and fruitful such fellowship in study and toil would be,—fellowship uniting both teachers and students in one sympathetic brotherhood, and all with their Lord and Master. So that the great purpose that brought him into the world, the salvation of our race, would be the supreme purpose of all.

THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THEOLOGY

THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THEOLOGY

By the late William Newton Clarke, D. D.,
Professor of Christian Theology in
Colgate University

Sometime during the year 1905, the late William Newton Clarke, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University, delivered the Nathaniel Taylor Lectures, before the Divinity School of Yale University, on "The Use of the Scriptures in Theology." His thoughts on this important and deeply interesting topic were urged upon the attention of young men about to go forth from their student life to preach the gospel. He divided his subject into four parts, "The Problem," "The Principle," "Results Negative," and "Results Positive." To each part he gave one discourse. These four discourses he subsequently published in a small volume, which, for a theological work, has been widely read. Among others, I perused it and laid it aside with no purpose of criticising it publicly. But some of my brethren in Boston urged me to present my views of it before the Baptist Ministers' Conference of that city, and simply out of a spirit of accommodation, I consented so to do.

I was reluctant in undertaking the task, not because I did not consider it important, but because I felt that some one else could perform it far better than I. But yielding to the importunity of those whom I very highly esteem, I presented my criticism of these popular lectures. In a more elaborate form I delivered my criticism before the Baptist Pastors' Conference at Providence, the Rochester Theological Seminary, and the Baptist Pastors' Conference of Chicago.

My personal relations with the author of this book have been exceedingly pleasant, and his Commentary on the Gospel of Mark has been a favorite of mine. So I approached the criticism of these lectures strongly prejudiced in favor of their author.

There are many utterances in this book which Christian men generally will endorse. He proposes to make theology Christocentric. This by most, if not by all, thinkers will certainly be approved. So much of Jesus' teaching as he presents, all that he says in behalf of thorough, honest investigation of the Scriptures, his ardent advocacy of setting forth fearlessly the real meaning of every part of the Bible, will unquestionably be cordially endorsed by every lover of biblical truth.

But much that he urges, very many, as devoted to the truth as the author claims to be, will hesitate to receive, will in all probability reject. At all events even his main contention that the sayings of Christ concerning God are the crown of

revelation, around which all the thought of his book is built, to my own mind is untenable.

Before formally stating this position, we must have clearly in mind the fact that the author wholly rejects the doctrine of inspiration. To be sure he quotes some Scripture, but never as inspired. "Theories of inspiration," he says, "have lately been passing out of sight." The word inspiration, he declares, is "ancient, ambiguous" and "confusing." The "idea of inspiration" is "ancient"; as though a doctrine may not be both ancient *and* true. And in this he does not inveigh against some unreasonable theory of inspiration, but against the fact of inspiration. We make this statement not for the purpose of combatting the author's position in reference to inspiration, but that we may fully understand his point of view; that we may get to his headquarters, where we can view things with his eyes and justly appreciate his reasoning.

Now, untrammeled by any notion of inspiration, he lays down the principle around which all of his discussion gathers; but before he enunciates it, he eulogistically apologizes for it. He says that it is "clear and sound." And before he finishes this lecture (p. 82) he says, "Now for a moment I must sing the praises of the principle that I have been trying to set forth." We have a right to expect that a principle so magnified, both before and after its announcement, should be new in theology. But is our expectation realized? Hear the author. "The principle is, that

the Christian element in the Scriptures is the indispensable and formative element in Christian theology, and is the only element in the Scriptures which Christian theology is either required or permitted to receive as contributing to its substance."

Now the author even ventures to think that this statement has a self-evident sound. He did not make a very bold venture. That principle has been accepted and acted upon by all Christian theologians since the Apostolic era. The tug of war comes only when the task is undertaken of finding out what is the Christian element in the Bible. This the author apprehends. " Here," he says, "questions throng."

But he seems to us to fail in the just application of his "clear and sound" principle. He properly begins his discussion of it with the teaching of Christ concerning God and man and their relations to each other, and declares that Christ, not only by what he says reveals God, but that he is himself the revelation of God. What Christ says about God, in statements more or less full, he several times repeats. Take a somewhat diffuse, but eloquent expression of it in his second lecture, (p. 58), Christ "assumed in God the reality of all that men need to find in him. A God for men to love, to trust, and to adore, a God who hates evil and desires to save men from its control, a God of free, forgiving grace, a God to whom men are precious and who seeks them in love, that he may make them what they ought to be, a God,

indeed, whose holy love is expressed in the love of Christ himself, which goes to death in order that it may save,—such a God Jesus has manifested and commended to our faith and affection.''

This, Dr. Clarke teaches, is the core of Christian theology. Whatever in the Bible, in the Old Testament or the New Testament agrees with this is Christian and should find place in Christian theology; whatever disagrees with it should be ruled out.

But has not the author made the basis of his Christian theology too narrow? Why build alone on what Christ taught concerning God and his attitude towards man? Why should not a Christian theologian take up into his theology *all* that Christ taught? Can he fail to do so, if he abides by the principle that the author has laid down with such a flourish of trumpets? Was there no law in Christ's teaching? He said that he came not to destroy the law, but to fill it out. He did not set it aside, but gave to it a new interpretation, showing how broad it is; that it lays hold of, and measures, not only outward conduct, but the thoughts and affections of the soul. He declared to his disciples that unless their righteousness exceeded that of the scribes and Pharisees they could in no case enter into the kingdom of God. In a word we find in his teaching the distilled essence of God's law.

But Dr. Clarke has not included in his basis of Christian theology Christ's teaching of the law.

Why not? Are we to receive some of his teachings and to ignore or reject others? Did Christ teach what is not Christian? That would be the absurdity of absurdities. Dr. Clarke says (p. 86), "whatever is in unison with the mind of Christ may enter" into Christian theology. And again, "As for law, the idea of obligation which it enshrines is perfectly Christian, just as it is perfectly natural and external." And yet he does not put it in with those teachings of Christ from which all Christian theology flows.

Nor in ascertaining the mind of Christ does he make any reference to his numerous utterances in which he expressed his hot indignation against sin, especially against hypocrisy and oppression. For example, have Christ's seven woes in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew no place in Christian theology? Is there in Christ no wrath against sin? Is he the revelation of a milk-and-water God?

In fact our author does not once allude to Christ's teachings concerning sin; teachings most vital and profound, which stand apart from all that Jew or Gentile taught in reference to it; which placed sin neither in the outward act, as did the Pharisee, nor in the intellect, as did the Greek, but in the affections, way down in the centre of man's being. Out of the heart, Christ said, proceed evil thoughts. Why omit such teachings from Christian theology?

Moreover, Dr. Clarke makes no reference to what Christ taught concerning his own person,

the necessity of his death, the judgment, and his resurrection. Have these great truths no place in a theology, which flows directly from Christ's teaching? If we are to have a theology on such a basis, let us put into that basis all of Christ's authentic utterances. Dr. Clarke has made the basis very much too narrow by ignoring in his criterion a large part of what Christ taught.

Then on this too narrow basis, made up simply of what Christ taught concerning God, the author starts out in quest of the Christian element in the rest of the Scriptures. But how shall we know that element? Why, nothing is easier; just "look at it and discern the quality" in it, just as you discern "the blue in the sky."

This seems to be simple and charming. This might perhaps captivate some of the callow and unthinking. Of course if we already know a truth, we recognize it wherever we find it. If that truth is expressed by Paul and we find it also in Genesis or Isaiah of course we identify it. If we learn from Christ that we ought to forgive our enemies, and read that David spared Saul, who was endeavoring to take his life, we say at once that is the forgiveness of an enemy incarnated. But by *such a process* we can never discover any new truth. The truth that we hold we may find in Scriptures where we had never before discerned it, but it is the same truth that we already have in possession.

To be sure we know some truths intuitively; not that we discover them intuitively; discovery

is one thing, intuitive apprehension is another. But when certain truths are taught us or are discovered by us, they are so fitted to our intellectual and moral natures, that we receive them as verities without proof or process of reasoning. But this is not what our author is talking about. He starts with certain truths made known by Christ concerning God and man to find in the Bible truth of like quality. "Look at it," he says, "and discern the quality." You ascertain it by comparison of qualities. Now if in this quest our author had taken along with him, so far as he was able, all the teachings of Christ, he would have found in the Bible much more of the Christian element than he has apparently discovered.

But starting with the truth concerning God outlined by our author, let us now ask *who* by looking at it, and discerning its quality, shall ascertain what is the Christian element in the Bible? You, as an individual? or I? Is each Christian believer to determine the Christian element for himself alone, without respect to others? As no two would fully agree, if each one wrought out a system of theology, should we not have a bewildering medley of theologies? The author declares that on his ground, we should have a standard of theology; what we determine to be Christian in the Bible would constitute that standard. But what a confusing variety of standards there would be! Christ himself taught some things that Dr. Clarke rejects. Then Paul discerned in the Old Testament some things that

he believed to be Christian, that our author squarely repudiates. Then the Greek and Latin Christians looked into the Scriptures and pointed out what they believed to be Christian; so did the reformers of the sixteenth century in Germany and England; so have the great theologians and preachers of the past century both in Europe and America, but our author disagrees with them all.

Where there is such disagreement as to what is the Christian element in the Bible, is there any use in searching for it? Most assuredly there is. But the value of the search comes from a combination of the results reached by all. The solidarity of the race is certainly no more true than that of Christian believers. The great apostle called them the *body* of Christ. What believers as a whole, believers of the past centuries and believers of the present day substantially agree upon as Christian in the Bible we may pretty safely trust. And this does not shut us up in any cast-iron system. The spirit of free inquiry is abroad. New light breaks in on the meaning of the word of God; and all real advances in the knowledge of the Bible will be taken up into the universal consciousness of Christendom and will find healthful and fruitful expression. Just as the people of the United States receive, largely unwittingly, the ethics of the New Testament as common law, so what is Christian in the Bible believers as a body discern and receive. If we are to appeal to the Christian consciousness to ascer-

tain what is the Christian element in the Scriptures, let us not appeal alone to our own subjective consciousness, nor to the subjective consciousness of some school of theologians, but to the universal Christian consciousness; if we do this and abide by the result, we shall not probably go far astray.

But this disturbs our author. He looks on the great mass of believers as in almost hopeless error in reference to the Bible. There are only an elect few that really understand it. "There is," he says, "a popular religious view of the Bible," and "a well accepted scholarly view," but, to use his own words, "between these two there is indeed an appalling difference, which nevertheless must some day be overcome. The problem is upon us."

What appals him ought, on his own principle, to cheer him. It shows him that the great mass of Christian believers are already in agreement as to what is Christian in the Bible; and with them stand many of the profoundest biblical scholars; while a few scholars have views of the Bible somewhat different from the vast mass of their brethren. Between the multitude and the few let brotherly love continue; but if we are to determine what is Christian in the Bible by just looking at it and seeing its quality, why should our author be appalled because hosts of believers, making, in strict accordance with his own principle, the search for this Christian element in the Scriptures, have found much more of it than

he has discovered? Are the discoveries of the few to be preferred to the discoveries of the many? Is the testimony of the many to be invalidated by that of a self-selected few? It is a pity that a man should stand appalled at the outcome of his own method of getting at the truth.

But since, in his judgment, the multitude cannot be trusted in this quest for the Christian element in the Scriptures, he kindly leads the way. He starts out with a criterion. It is what Christ teaches about God and man and their relations to one another. This he declares is the crown and glory of revelation. In his search he first turns backward to the Old Testament to find what may be Christian there. Whatever he finds in those more ancient records that has the quality of the very crown of revelation is Christian; where that quality does not appear, there may be suggestive history, but nothing more. Is this a fair procedure? Does our author sufficiently keep in mind that the Bible is a progressive revelation of God? That real Christian truth may have been for a long period but partially revealed? Yet, what was revealed was truly Christian? If a man should now take the most perfectly constructed steam-engine, and going backward in time should say, "Whatever agrees with this is a steam-engine, and what does not may belong to history, but is not a steam-engine," we should think him quite unfair and illogical. Any improvement in the engine which he now regards

as a criterion would in turn set it aside as no engine at all. But the crude engine at the beginning was a real engine; it was never set aside; it has been improved from time to time till it has reached its present state of perfection. So, far back in the past God was imperfectly but really revealed to men; and as time swept on the revelation of his character became more and more complete until we reach the highest revelation of Him in Jesus Christ.

That Dr. Clarke did not keep in mind as he should have done the progress of doctrine, as it is presented to us in the Bible, is clear from the whole sweep of his discussion, and also from the phrases which he employs. He says in his last lecture, that in early times God was not "*rightly known*" (p. 132), or "rightly pictured"; where *fully* known, or correctly pictured, would seem to be preferable. He says again that we must set forth "the right God." Such expressions show very plainly that the development of doctrine finds scant place in our author's consciousness.

But having pointed out what seems to us a serious defect in these lectures, let us follow the author, so far as time will permit, while he brings the Old Testament to the touchstone of his criterion. But at the very start he abandons his chosen method and declares that what Genesis says about "the manner in which the world and man were created" and "concerning the origin of human sin" is not historical, and so has nothing to do with Christian theology.

This is a strange reason for rejecting a section of Scripture as a source of theology. While the Sermon on the Mount has an historical setting, it in itself is not a relation of history, nevertheless it contains considerable material for theology. The eighth chapter of Romans is not historical, i. e. in it no history is related, but it is a rich theological mine. Does Dr. Clarke propose to rend in pieces the first chapters of Genesis, to tear out of the web of this section of the Scriptures the account of the creation of the world and of man and of the origin of sin and leave the rest of it? This would be a bold procedure even for the most destructive critic. However one would naturally think from his silence on this point that he summarily rules out the first chapters of Genesis as contributing nothing to theology. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," does not that belong to Christian theology? "So God created man in his own image," does not that belong to Christian theology, and does it not belong to the "*manner*" in which God created man? The seed of the woman "shall bruise thy head (the serpent's head) and thou shalt bruise his heel." Does not that belong to Christian theology? Man disobeyed God and was punished for it. Is that no contribution to Christian theology? In the nineteenth chapter of Matthew Christ quotes words from the first, second, and fifth chapters of Genesis, which he regarded as the very foundation of monogamy. Has that no place in Christian theology? (Gen. 1:27; 2:24;

5:2). "And Enoch walked with God; and he was not for God took him." That seems to harmonize with Christian theology.

As to the historical character of these first chapters of Genesis advanced critics differ. The fact of the creation of the universe, of man in God's image, of creation in different periods is evidently scientific and historical. The account of man's sinning seems to be the rub with our author. He gives a separate paragraph to it. But because we have the story of it in symbolical language, does that show it to be unhistorical? Much of the history of Assyria and Egypt is written in symbols. Paul explicitly refers to man's creation in his first epistle to Timothy and treats it as history, also in Romans as a fact well accredited, and in his first epistle to the Corinthians he speaks of "the first man, Adam." It is quite possible that he knew as much about the subject as some modern critics.

But Dr. Clarke says that so far as he knows, Christ never referred to "the origin of human sin" (p. 90). We have no reference in his recorded utterances to the passage in Genesis on which we have commented; but he does refer, it seems to me, to the fact that man was once in a different condition from that in which he is now. He spoke of him as lost. He emphasized that. He wrote three great parables to set forth the sad fact, the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, and the lost son; and he declared that the great object

for which he came into the world was "to seek and to save that which was lost" (Lk. 19:10). Man once in a happier state wandered from it and got lost. Then, as we have already seen, Christ does quote words from these unhistorical chapters.

But why is our author, together with men of his school of thought, so anxious to get rid of the account of the origin of sin? Would the admission of it vitiate theology? If sin is not eternal it began sometime and somewhere. It is universal among men now. But those who object to the account of its origin as given in the third chapter of Genesis, do so because they believe that account to be unscientific, contradictory to the law of evolution. Now, without discussing at all the doctrine of evolution, it seems to me that they unwittingly misrepresent it. They regard the process of evolution when once begun as going steadily on and upward in an unbroken line. Scientists do not so understand it. As they trace its workings in the physical universe they discover that it is irregular in its onward movement; that there has been not only progression but also at times startling retrogression. If under the law of evolution there has been in the physical universe such retrogression, why not in the sphere of the moral or spiritual? The doctrine of the fall of man, in my judgment, in no way conflicts with the best established deliverances of science on evolution. That which is both Scriptural and scientific, and pertains to the very heart of Chris-

tian theology should not be turned out of doors by a Christian theologian.

Having, to his own satisfaction, disposed of the first chapters of Genesis, Dr. Clarke finds in the rest of the Old Testament considerable material that should have place in Christian theology. Much found in the messages of the prophets, the best of the Psalms, and "illuminating history," presenting the struggle "toward true knowledge of God," all make valuable contributions to Christian theology. To be sure Dr. Clarke makes in reference to this no very definite statements; he does not clearly draw the line between what in the prophets and the Psalms he regards as Christian and what as non-Christian; but by his general statements he leaves upon my mind the impression that, in his judgment, the Christian element in the Old Testament is by no means insignificant.

But now, not departing from his headquarters, we wonder that he is not more specific. We refresh our minds with what he has put into his criterion, teachings concerning God and man and their relations to one another, which he calls the crown of revelation. Whatever is kin to this is Christian. As one drags a magnet through sand and iron-filings in order to gather out the latter from their baser surroundings, so with the passages of Scripture that are the crown of revelation, he sweeps through the Old Testament, that he may gather out all that has affinity to them. By that process he should have found something

more specific; he might have discovered in the Old Testament every thought contained in those sayings of Christ that he styles "the crown of revelation."

Here of course the stress is upon the attitude of God towards men; and the Old Testament declares the mercy and compassion of God towards men with an emphasis and iteration that cannot be matched in the New;* and forgiveness for sin is set forth with such richness and fulness that the Christian instinctively turns to the Old Scriptures that his assurance of God's forgiveness may be reinforced. In substantiation of our claim let us cite a few declarations from the Old Testament. I think that our author cannot justly object to this, even though he is opposed to the proof-text method, since every now and then he quotes a text, when he thinks that it will serve him a good turn; and even his criterion, by which he professes to measure all theology, is made up from the sayings of Christ. So let us, by specific declarations found in the Old Testament, see in what attitude God was declared to stand towards men, hundreds of years before Christ came.

In the very heart of the decalogue, while God is represented as "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate" him, it is also declared that he shows mercy unto thousands (of generations) of them that love him and keep

* Schultz's Old Testament Theology, Goettengen.

his commandments. On Sinai, where the law was given, the Lord passed before Moses and proclaimed, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin" (Ex. 34:6-7).

During the time of Zedekiah, amid widespread corruption, a Bible historian declares that the Lord God sent his messengers unto his rebellious people, "rising up betimes and sending, because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling place" (2 Chron. 36:15). In many passages in the prophets God is represented in the same way; and the Psalms, which are the expression of individual experience, abound with declarations of God's love and compassion to men. He pities them as a father does his children (103:13), is more tender than an earthly father and mother; "when my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up" (27:10). The Lord delights in mercy, he is gracious and full of compassion (145:7), his paths are mercy and truth (25:10), unto him mercy belongs (62:12), he is plenteous in mercy (86:5), his mercy is everlasting (100:5), and it is great above the heavens (108:4). These are simply representative utterances. Is it not clear that the lawgiver, and the Prophets and Psalmists of Israel knew the Lord that Jesus proclaimed to men? Also the relation between Jehovah and his people is the same as that set forth by Christ;

"I shall be their God and they shall be my people" is the prophetic word.

And as to the duty of men to God and to one another, Jesus drew the Godward precept from Deuteronomy and the manward from Leviticus. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. 6:5), and "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev. 19:18). "On these two commandments," said Christ, "hang all the law and the prophets" (Matt. 22:40).

Even from this cursory survey, it is evident to my own mind, that Jesus' teaching concerning God and man is not the crown of revelation. His words on these subjects contain nothing that had not before been announced, nothing that is not found in the Old Testament. To this we shall return again.

In the meantime we will still further follow our author in his search for material which, in his judgment, has rightfully a place in Christian theology. He turns to the New Testament; here as in the Old Testament he makes some eliminations. In these eliminations he surprises us by beginning with the words of Christ. All the words of Christ, whose utterances concerning God and man are considered the crown of revelation, are not fit material for Christian theology. The author admits that in the 24th of Matthew, Christ is represented as teaching his second coming. But the whole notion of the second coming is Jewish; so either Christ unwittingly fell into the popular

notion concerning it, or declarations are attributed to him that he never made. The first supposition is abhorrent, and the last is a too common makeshift to get rid of some supposed difficulty.

While we believe the author's genesis of the doctrine of the second coming of Christ to be a figment of the imagination, he ought to have explained why a notion is necessarily untrue simply because it is Jewish. Is nothing that is Jewish true?

As to the doctrine of the second coming of Christ our author's contention seems to be, Christ has not come according to apostolic expectation and therefore he will not; and if he should come again it would be a retrograde, rather than an advanced, movement. That Christ will not come again, no man can declare, since no man knows; what seems delay to us very likely is not so to Him with whom a thousand years are as one day. And as to his coming being contrary to the present development of Christianity, we should not forget how the personal appearance of Christ subdued and transformed Saul of Tarsus, and that the last of the apostles wrote, "When he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is."

But our author not only rejects the doctrine of the second coming of Christ as foreign to Christian theology, but also all ideas in Paul's epistles which are expressed in terms of Jewish sacrifice or in forms of Roman law. He also rules out for

the flimsiest reasons, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and quite ignores the Revelation. Time will not permit us to go into a discussion of these things. While these rejected Scriptures are not necessarily antagonistic to what Christ taught concerning God, they have so little in common with it, that the author from his point of view, must necessarily reject them. He thinks them to be on a lower plane. That is an hallucination; they are on a higher plane.

But in his eliminating process two things demand our special attention. Like all of his class of interpreters he wishes to efface the representation of God as a King. He grants of course that the Scriptures so present him to us, and that even Christ is so characterized in the New Testament. But while this was fitting enough in past ages, it is no longer so. It suggests arbitrariness in God, makes one think of him as tyrannical. Even if we recall to mind that "the King eternal, immortal, invisible" is absolutely wise and just, and in love so identifies himself with his subjects that he regards whatever is done to them as done to himself, still we cannot free the name from its bad associations. So this name so often in the past given to God or God in Christ must be relegated to everlasting oblivion. How does Dr. Clarke attempt to sweep away so inveterate a mode of speech? His method of doing it is fascinating on account of its simplicity. In spite of the viciousness of the proof-text method, he quotes Jesus' words to the Samaritan woman;

"God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;" and then tells us that by this declaration Jesus swept away all anthropomorphisms; and of course the representation of God as a King went with the rest.

Now that seems to be neatly done; the only trouble with it is it is not true. We cannot think of personality at all except in the terms of personality with which we are familiar; on that account we can no more get rid of anthropomorphisms than we can get rid of ourselves. Christ never intended that we should. He said, when you pray say, "Our Father." Over and over again he called God his Father. Is not that anthropomorphism? Does Dr. Clarke refuse to say, "The Lord is my shepherd"? but to call God a shepherd is rank anthropomorphism. He who taught his disciples to say "Our Father" also taught them to pray, "Thy kingdom come." We can't have a kingdom without a king. In the most solemn hour of Jesus' earthly career he declared that he had a kingdom and acknowledged to Pilate that he was a king. Just the anthropomorphism that seems to trouble our author. After his resurrection he announced that all authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth. That looks like sovereignty and suggests a throne.

But the second thing in this part of our discussion to claim our attention for a moment is still more weighty and serious. In his criterion, made up of what Jesus taught about God, he finds

no mention made of sacrifice. So in the application of this criterion he gets rid of all propitiation.

If he means that he has gotten rid of the heathenish idea that an angry God is appeased by bloody sacrifice, all intelligent Christian men are with him the world over; but if he means that Christ did not offer himself a sacrifice to God on our behalf, we are compelled to take issue with him. Evidently there was something in God that demanded the sacrifice of Christ. While God's law is, "The soul that sins shall die," the sinless One died; as the apostle says, "The just for the unjust." He who demanded the sacrifice made it. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. The death of the spotless Christ for our sins, both met the demand in God for the punishment of sin, and set forth before the universe the exceeding sinfulness of sin.

Our author seems to reverse the Scriptural idea of sacrifice. In the Bible sacrifice is always spoken of as primarily offered unto God. The sacrifices of Israel were so offered. So the sacrifice of Christ is represented in the New Testament. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, "who (Christ) through an eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God." Sacrifices of praise were offered to God. Even a gift to Paul from the Church at Philippi is called by him "a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God." Such is the universal use of the word in the Scriptures. But our author, together with the school to which he belongs, uses the word to designate

exclusively something done at cost to ourselves for our fellowmen. The thought thus expressed is thoroughly Christian, but not the main idea of Scriptural sacrifice. And when our author gets rid of propitiation he seems to mean that he gets rid of the Godward reach of sacrifice; that is, in his judgment, sacrifice to God has apparently no place in Christian theology.

To substantiate his position he declares that Christ in his teaching never referred to sacrifice in that sense. Well, at all events, his forerunner did. Pointing out Jesus to his disciples he exclaimed, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." And Jesus confirmed these words of John the Baptist. He was showing his disciples that true greatness in his kingdom is obtained only through service, and declared that "the Son of Man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Dr. Clarke, unfolding the meaning of these words in his Commentary on Mark, says:

"A ransom is the price paid for the release of prisoners or captives. The word *for,* in the sense of "instead of" (a ransom *for* many) is entirely appropriate, since ransom is naturally conceived of as taking the place of the persons who are delivered by it, or serving instead of them. An idea of vicariousness, or action in the place of others, resides in this word, as well as in the word ransom itself. The phrase falls in with the other language of Scripture, which represents the giving up of his life as the indispensable means for the deliverance of men from sin; and of this he was thinking when he spoke of the supreme act of service, the giving of his life a ransom for many. In order to minister thus to men he came into the world."

Again in his comment on these words (Mk. 14: 24), "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many," he declares, Christ "says that he sheds his own blood as covenant blood to bring God and man into the actual union and fellowship promised in the New Covenant. His offering of himself is to be acceptable in the sight of God as the blood sprinkled on the altar was, and it is to be accepted by men, through faith, as the means by which they are brought into "the eternal covenant" of genuine fellowship with God." . . . "His offering of himself reaches Godward and manward."

This is so obviously the teaching of Christ that it is pitiable to think that the author now avers that Jesus never referred to his offering himself a sacrifice to God.

But we now come to our final criticism. We are told that in constructing a Christian theology we are not strictly confined to the Christian element in the Bible, but whatever truly flows out of that element, whatever congruous inference may be made from it belongs to the very substance of theology. The theologian is to set before himself "that glorious body of living truth which Jesus has given us," and he is invited to contribute "if he is able to the positive contents of theology" (p. 86). Perhaps he can do this. "He may be able to rule out, with divine authority, something that has remained to vex theology by its incongruous character." This may be possible. There is no *a priori* objection to any man's adding some-

thing to the very substance of theology. But who has ever added to theology an iota of truth not found in the Bible? Bring on your man, and let him bring on the addition that he has made!

But we should care little for what the author has said on this score, were it not for the fact that he represents the apostles simply as ordinary theologians, making deductions from Christ's teachings. While what they said is not "identical in expression or in thought" (p. 136) with him, it is a development from him. When John wrote, "God is love," it was "a conclusion drawn" from the effect of Christ's revelation (p. 148); and much more of like import.

In all this, he does not, it sems to me, deal with the apostles in the scientific spirit, in strict accordance with the facts. When he considers the weight or authority of their utterances as compared with those of Christ, he makes no account of the fact that they like their Lord were led by the Spirit, and that their apprehension of the truth by the illumination of the Spirit, was simply the carrying out of Christ's purpose concerning them. He announced to the apostles, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." For that reason, whether certain men think it to be sufficient or not, many of the ablest theologians have received the deliverances of the apostles as equally authoritative with those of the Master.

But our author insists that there is a Pauline, and a Johanine gospel, and that while each was a "development" from Christ's teaching, each differed from it; that is, did not in all respects truthfully represent it, or was in some respects contradictory to it. But can any man show that the apostles in presenting the truths of the gospel ever parted company with their Lord? Each indeed had his own style of utterance, but was as true to the doctrine of Christ as is the needle to the pole. He differed from his Master only in presenting some new aspects of truth into which the Spirit led him, and which the disciples were not fitted to receive from the lips of their Lord. For example, Paul gave a loftier view of marriage than Christ did. In his epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. 5:23-25), he glorifies the relation by declaring it to be like that which subsists between Christ and the church. The apostles give us a grander view of Christ than we find in the gospels; they present him to us in his glory, only a glimpse of which during his earthly ministry was caught on the mount of transfiguration; a glory that does not remove him from us, since he comes to us in the Spirit and dwells in us as in a temple. Though he has passed into the heavens he is still touched with the feeling of our infirmities. And it remained for him whom Jesus specially loved to reach the grandest height in the revelation of God, so that he wrote, "God is love."—Was that a conclusion drawn from Christ's teaching concerning the character of God, as a logician draws

a conclusion from certain established premises? Did not rather this profoundest truth concerning God pour forth from the depths of John's personal experience, as he was touched and illuminated by the divine Spirit?

But why does our author entertain what seems to us to be a low and unworthy view of the apostles? Chiefly, I think, in mistaking what is the crown of revelation. We have already pointed out that if that crown is merely the teachings of Christ, Dr. Clarke ought in consistency to include in it *all* of Christ's utterances. Making the teachings of Christ in their totality the criterion of what should find place in Christian theology, the scope and substance of that theology would be far greater than is contemplated by the author. And we have also already shown that what Christ taught concerning the character of God is found in the Old Testament. So, important as that teaching is, it is evidently not the crown of revelation. Jesus Christ himself is its crown. Not what Christ said, but what Christ is and what Christ did is the crown of revelation. To be sure Dr. Clarke himself asserts that Christ is the revelation of God to us, but he makes little or no use of the fact in determining what in the Scriptures is Christian. If he had firmly held on to that fact, and added it to his criterion for determining what from the Scriptures should enter into Christian theology, he would have shown greater hospitality to apostolic teaching. He would not have treated so scantily and obscurely the death and

resurrection and glorification of Christ. If he had at all properly estimated what Jesus did on his cross, he would not have so summarily dismissed the epistle to the Hebrews, and he would not practically have ignored the fact that we have in the cross the highest exhibition of God's righteousness and love, and in Christ's resurrection the irrefragable proof that he is the Son of God. He is thereby declared, says Paul, "to be the Son of God with power." It was chiefly with this crown of divine revelation in Christ that the apostles had to do, not with what Jesus *said* about God.

This is clearly evident from the most cursory examination of the New Testament. Even in the gospels where are recorded the matchless sayings of Jesus, large space is given to his judicial trial, condemnation, death, burial and resurrection. He himself laid the emphasis on his death. Just before Gethsemane and the cross he said to his disciples; "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." All that he had said would be fruitless without his death. He gave to his followers a perpetual memorial, not of his sayings, but of his death. Whatever else they forgot, he wanted them to remember *that,* and to keep it in remembrance, Paul said, "till he come." The apostles in their preaching did not dwell on the sayings of Christ, but on his death, resurrection and exaltation at the right hand of God. They were ab-

sorbed in what Christ is and in what Christ wrought.

That they were not chiefly occupied with the utterances of Christ is also confirmed by the fact that, as the ablest critics now generally agree, Paul's chief epistles were written before the gospels. How largely by tradition the sayings of Jesus may have found place in his mind, we cannot tell; but in his writings he only now and then refers to any of them; but he dwells on Christ's death for our sins and his resurrection and glory. He probably never saw Christ except in his glory, and he proclaimed the glorified one. What directly flowed out of these great facts he wrought into his theology.

In accordance with this view, Dr. Bernhard Weiss says, "At the basis of the whole apostolic preaching, lies the assumption that the work of Christ was by no means completed during his earthly life, that this was rather the antecedent condition and the beginning of a work which will be carried on by the risen Christ through means entirely new and with all-embracing success, and which will be completed only in the future."*

He also says, "The Christian faith would have remained just as it is, and lost no part of what is its deepest foundation, had it pleased God to leave *only the Apostolic teaching* as it lies before us in the epistles of the New Testament, and along with the Gospels, to deprive us of all information from

* Weiss, The Life of Christ, vol. I, p. 11.

which we might have wrought out for ourselves a detailed picture of Jesus' earthly life.'"*

That is, the apostles with the great fact of Christ and what he did, guided by the Spirit, unfolded therefrom the great essential, saving truths of the gospel. But Dr. Clarke, thinking that he has the essence of revelation in what Christ says about God, for the most part ignores the most vital, fundamental truths of the gospel as set forth by the apostles.

These are a few of the many considerations suggested to us as we read this small volume from the pen of Dr. Clarke. Other criticisms enticed us, which, for lack of time, we must leave unspoken. But we cannot refrain from noticing in closing,

First, that the book is a singular compound of subjectivism and objectivism. The author declares that the Scriptures are the basis of theology, but since only a part of them can be included in that basis, and what shall be admitted rests upon the subjective approval of each theologian, it is clear that the basis is uncertain and shifty. It may at any moment be enlarged or curtailed. The historical character of the gospel becomes of little or no account. The preponderating and shaping force of this theology is undeniably subjective. Just as the spider spins its gossamer thread from its own bowels, so a theologian of this stamp, in the main, spins his theology out of his own inner consciousness. But the spinning

* Weiss, The Life of Christ, vol. I, p. 15.

spider has one advantage over him, it attaches its thread to something solid, while he attaches his to a wave of the sea which is driven by the wind and tossed; the resultant theology must be unstable in all its parts. In fact with such a theory, what the writings of the Bible are, when or by whom composed, is of little or no value. This the author declares in his last lecture. He says (p. 145) that the Christian element "comes with power to render theology very largely independent of Biblical criticism." He thus opens up a paradise to lazy preachers and theologians. Still, in his second lecture, he declares that his principle requires the theologian to have "all knowledge of the Bible" (p. 85). How he is to have it when very largely delivered from the study of biblical criticism, does not seem quite clear to the uninitiated.

Second, the outcome of what our author advocates, as suggested by himself, is hardly alluring. In his last lecture he once more elaborately sets forth what Christ taught concerning the character of God, and declares that in this light (p. 139) the questions of theology are solved. "What," in this light, "is the significance of Man? Man is the beloved creature of such a God, bearing his likeness. What is sin? Sin is the opposite of such a God, spoiling such a creature. What is salvation? Salvation is the work of God for such a creature against such an evil. How is salvation accomplished? If we need to know, it is accomplished as such a God will accomplish it. What is the divine life in man? Life with such a

God, wrought by such a God. What is human destiny? It is such as such a God will provide for such a creature." Comment is unnecessary. For deft indefiniteness where can we find a paragraph to match it?

Third, the downright dogmatism of the author is noteworthy. He seems to be cocksure in all his utterances. He evidently cherishes not the slightest misgiving as to the main position which he sets forth and defends. Even the extreme results of the higher criticism, still regarded as doubtful by many of the critics themselves, he unhesitatingly receives as settled. His positiveness will be apt to convince some even when his cherished views have slight scientific foundation. Assuredly offensive dogmatism is confined to no school of thought.

Fourth, as to the question of authority, so much discussed just now, his statements to a reader like myself are somewhat confusing. He denies that the Scriptures are authoritative as to theology; they should not dictate but inspire theology. On this he is both clear and copious. But still he declares that "the idea of obligation which" the law "enshrines is perfectly Christian." He also declares that in God is the seat of authority, to which all will readily assent. What is not fully clear is, if to God only belongs authority, and God's will and character are revealed to us in the Scriptures, why do not the Scriptures have some sort of authority in reference to theology? Then he asserts that theology is based on the Scriptures, and that

the theologian may, with divine authority, rule out what vexes theology; if the theologian who gets his theology from the Scriptures has divine authority to rid theology of vexations, how is it that those Scriptures are utterly without authority in theology? How does the theologian have divine authority and the Scriptures none? This is puzzling to one on the outside.

Fifth, the author in his first lecture insists at length that theologians, regarding the Scriptures as inspired, have treated the Bible as equal in all its parts. Now that is a man of straw; there never were any such theologians. While many of them have held that all the books of the Bible were written by inspired men, they have never regarded these books as equal in content and importance. For example, they have never regarded the Chronicles as equal to the gospel of Matthew, or Ecclesiastes as equal to the Epistle to the Romans.

But in a subsequent lecture, our author declares that all in the past (pp. 70-72), theologians included, have esteemed some Scriptures above others, have, in fact, really acted according to his principle in preferring one Scripture to another. This seems to me to be unquestionably true. But how can these two discordant representations moving on a single track in opposite directions, avoid a disastrous head collision?

Sixth, our author's acceptance of the radical view in reference to the gospel of John, is at least somewhat suggestive. "This gospel," he says,

"embodies what some great Christian has thought concerning Jesus" (p. 149). He again says: "Perhaps, indeed, it is the work of a later spiritual genius, who portrays Jesus, and puts words in his mouth as he conceives him in the light of faith and love and theological reflection" (p. 148). This then is the author's conception; after the apostle John had passed away, some "spiritual genius" arose, who gave to the world by far the grandest and loftiest views of Christ that were ever uttered; who so vividly depicted scene after scene in the gospel as to make the acutest, ablest men of the church believe him to have been an eyewitness of what he portrayed; who put into the mouth of Jesus not only the declaration on which the author comments, "God is a Spirit," but also of course Christ's entire conversation with the Samaritan woman, his controversial discourses with the Pharisees in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters of the gospel, his farewell discourse to the disciples in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, and the Lord's great intercessory prayer in the seventeenth chapter. A "spiritual genius!" Did the world ever see or even dream of the like? Yet, nobody since has ever identified him.

But we must not overlook the fact that after, through "theological reflection," he had composed the discourse in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters of this gospel and the intercessory prayer in the seventeenth, and put them into the mouth of Christ, this man, capable

of such profound spiritual insight and utterance, crowned his gospel with a lie. He said that he who wrote these things was that disciple whom Jesus loved, who leaned on his breast at supper. Such an explanation of the authorship of John's gospel makes too great a demand on credulity and common sense.

Seventh, The Bible has been assaulted by critics from the time of Celsus till the present hour; it has often been unskillfully and foolishly interpreted by its friends; but it has survived both friends and foes and keeps right on its beneficent way. Its endurance is one pregnant proof that it came from God. It will outlive all the merely theoretical solutions and readjustments of our time. All that modern scholarship discovers that is true will of course abide; all in its criticism that is not scientifically based will soon drop into oblivion. But the Bible in spite of all theorizing and crude discussion will survive. Upon the seal of the French Bible Society is the picture of a Bible in the form of an anvil, around which are lying many broken hammers, and under it is the motto: "The Hammers Break: The Anvil Abides Forever." The same thought is put still more eloquently by Peter (1 Pet. 1:24);

> "All flesh is as grass,
> And all the glory thereof as the flower of grass.
> The grass withereth, and the flower fadeth:
> But the word of the Lord abideth forever."

Then Peter tells us what he means by the word: "And this is the word of good tidings which was

preached unto you." He who wrote these words preached on the day of Pentecost. What was the word of good tidings that he proclaimed? Not the sayings of Christ about God, but Jesus of Nazareth himself; Jesus of Nazareth "approved of God unto you by mighty works, and wonders and signs"; Jesus of Nazareth crucified and slain; Jesus of Nazareth raised from the dead; Jesus of Nazareth exalted by the right hand of God; Jesus of Nazareth pouring forth the Holy Spirit upon men. This is the center and substance of the word of God that lives and abides forever, the word that must be the warp and woof of all true Christian theology.

HOW TO DEVELOP CHRISTIAN BENEVOLENCE

HOW TO DEVELOP CHRISTIAN BENEVOLENCE

It is assumed in this topic that benevolence, at least in germ, already exists in Christians. This assumption is valid. Even among the heathen, where selfishness predominates, benevolence manifests itself spasmodically. This may be accounted for from the fact that while sin has defaced, it has not utterly obliterated, the image of God in man. Hence we have, even in pagans, still some faint sporadic reflections of the divine benevolence. In the unconverted of Christian lands these manifestations are still more frequent. For while they do not possess the spirit of Christ, they have been lifted up by the general influence of Christianity, and have been unconsciously moulded by its precepts. Hence they frequently manifest by their acts of charity and by their gifts, its benevolence. But if this be true of the heathen, and of the unregenerate in communities nominally Christian, it is clear that those in whom the image of God has been retraced by the divine Spirit, who have been filled, even partially, with the spirit of Christ, possess, at least, the beginnings of his benevolence. An avaricious Christian is simply a contradiction of terms. The divine life begins in giving ourselves and all that we have to Christ; the development

of it can be secured only by forgetting self, and giving time and talent and money for the good of our fellow men, and the glory of God. And whatever a man's experience or "frames" of mind may have been, if he has no benevolent impulses, he cannot be a Christian. But if in every true believer the benevolence of Christ has been implanted, like all other Christian graces it needs to be unfolded. How can such development, so vastly important to Christian character, on the one hand, and to all our enterprises of benevolence on the other, be secured?

First, by the general development of Christian character. While the graces of the believer are separable as objects of thought, they are, like buds on a tree, the manifestation of one indivisible life within. When one is quickened, all are quickened. If, therefore, we would unfold any special grace, we must stimulate and develop the life which underlies and feeds the whole. Just as a physician, who desires to bring into healthful action any organ of the body which has become torpid, tones up the whole system, so, if we wish to bring into vigorous exercise Christian benevolence, we must aim primarily to perfect the fellowship of believers with Christ. Filled, through such fellowship, with his life and his spirit, the entire Christian character will be invigorated and unfolded. Then the believer will find it easy to pray, and equally easy, according to his ability, to give. In fact such acts become the channels through which the divine life, pent up within,

must flow out. Giving to help others and to glorify God is as natural and agreeable to one who has real fellowship with Christ, as breathing is to our bodies. Hence it is that genuine revivals of religion pay church debts, inaugurate new mission enterprises, and put new life and power into the old. Covetousness in professors of religion is as sure a sign of the decline or want of piety as prayerlessness. If then we would develop Christian benevolence, it must be our constant aim to promote in all our churches, genuine revivals of religion, and we must give ourselves no rest till we see the churches manifestly swayed and controlled by the spirit of Christ. A soul when first brought into union with Christ possesses, in a measure, his benevolence. The more perfect that union becomes, the more expansive will be the benevolence which flows forth from such fellowship with the Lord.

In the second place, Christian benevolence cannot be adequately developed without much special instruction on the duty of giving money to aid all important Christian enterprises. Such instruction is absolutely demanded in reference to other Christian duties. All concede the importance of instructing the churches in such duties as prayer, exhortation, honesty, and the observance of the Sabbath. If without line upon line, precept upon precept, such duties will not be adequately understood and faithfully performed, we cannot reasonably expect that the duty of giving will be without like full and persistent instruction.

But by whom shall such instruction in benevolence be given? In some measure, by men outside of our respective churches, who, by occasional addresses, may stir them up to give. The religious press should help largely in this work. The laymen of our churches, who apprehend and feel the duty of giving, may do much, by word and example, toward leading their brethren to devote their wealth to Christ; but the responsibility in the main unquestionably rests on the pastors. As their spiritual leaders are, so on the whole will the churches be. If a pastor in his utterances manifests something of the tenderness and faithfulness of Christ, he can, by persistency in instruction and appeal, lift any church up out of penuriousness into benevolence. By what instrumentality?

He is called to expound God's word. This is his chief duty. He must, if he fulfils his calling, preach both the doctrines and duties of the Scriptures. As he enforces the duties, that of giving will find its place. All the warnings of God's word against covetousness, and trust in uncertain riches, all that is said concerning the right use of wealth, should be faithfully set forth in the pulpit. And since practical materialism shuts out from many minds the reality and importance of spiritual things, those Scriptures which present the transitory nature of material wealth should be enforced with special emphasis. Christians who have wealth or are bending all their energies to accumulate it, should be often re-

minded that man shall not live by bread alone, that all their riches which do not contribute to the intellectual and spiritual elevation of themselves and others are simply an unmitigated curse; that only what they give for the good of their fellowmen and to glorify God is really saved. Quaint old Thomas Fuller said that Job lost his sheep, but saved his wool; for with the fleeces of his flocks he had warmed the loins of the poor. Pastors must do what they can to teach their churches this secret of saving money. Nor must they fail to set in a strong light the reflex influences of giving on the character of the giver. One object of all Christian duty is the unfolding of Christian character. Each duty has a blessing at both ends of it. It blesses both him to whom it is done, and him who does it. Now all the duties of the Christian life are necessary to secure, by their reflex influence, the complete and symmetrical development of the believer's character. No duty can be omitted without irreparable damage. As I passed along the street I saw a willow, green and thrifty on one side, but decayed on the other. It had no symmetry nor beauty. Its branches were twisted, the trunk was misshapen; the living wood, on either side of that which was rotting away, was endeavoring to stretch itself over the decay, as if in shame it would hide from view the deformity. This, thought I, is a fitting symbol of those professors of religion who pray and read the Bible and are thereby green and thrifty on one side, but because

they cannot be induced to give, are struck with the dry-rot of covetousness on the other. Their characters, instead of being symmetrical and attractive, are unsightly and repulsive. To secure a character fully rounded out, it is as necessary for men to give as to pray, and to give without ceasing as to pray without ceasing.

Moreover, the duty of giving liberally should be urged upon the members of our churches, so far as it is possible, when they are in the first stages of their Christian experience. They should be taught, as early as practicable, the whole round of Christian duty. When they are received into the church they should be made to understand that giving must hold a prominent place among their duties; that they will be expected, according to their ability, to contribute cheerfully to sustain the services of the church with which they unite, and to aid the work of missions in all of its departments. To fix in their minds at such a time the responsibility of giving, is comparatively an easy task. Then their hearts are warm and susceptible to religious impressions; they are all aglow with new-born love for their Saviour; a suggestion from their pastor at such a time, made either in public or private, will usually be sufficient to lead them to put giving among the primal duties of the Christian life. When men have grown old in covetousness, they are often quite unimpressible. Lignum vitæ only faintly suggests their hardness. If there is any gold in them, it can be gotten out only as they are broken

in pieces by God's law, as gold bearing quartz is shivered to atoms in a quartz crusher. Whether such men will ever get to heaven, the judgment will determine. Perhaps a camel will sooner go through the eye of a needle; but such covetousness, bringing with it possible eternal disaster, may, in many cases, be averted by teaching all young converts, when their hearts are susceptible to every good impression, the doctrine of Scriptural benevolence.

And when men of wealth ask for admission into our churches, ought we not to determine before we receive them whether they are ready to give according to their means? Should we not as decisively refuse to baptize a covetous man as a prayerless one? We sometimes very fittingly ask an applicant for church membership, "Do you pray?" "Yes." "Do you enjoy prayer?" "Yes." Why not, at least in some cases, also ask, "Do you give your money to aid the cause of Christ?" "Yes." "Do you enjoy it?" And if the applicant could answer this last question in the affirmative, would it not be as clear an evidence of conversion as enjoyment of prayer?

But suppose a pastor does teach in all its length and breadth the doctrine of benevolence, and also insists on baptizing only those who are ready to give as well as to pray, will the benevolence of his church thereby be developed? It assuredly will be, if the pastor speaks every word in love, and is not impatient if he does not see immediate re-

sults. Men can never be moved to benevolence by vituperation. Many do not give because they have never been fully instructed in the duty. They should not be denounced, but in love the whole Scriptural doctrine should be laid out before them. Nor should pastors lose heart, if these men do not at once reach up in practice to the full height of this important duty. They should remember that the education and prejudices of a lifetime are in many cases to be overcome, and that all healthful educational processes are slow. But the truth patiently presented, year after year, in various forms, will at last as certainly accomplish its mission, as the rains and the sunlight of the revolving years unfold in grandeur and beauty the trees of the forest.

But pastors are called upon not only to unfold to their churches all that the Scriptures teach concerning the duty of giving, but also to present the claims of such benevolences as their churches may be able to meet. At the beginning of the year, so far as practicable, a scheme of benevolence should be determined by each church, so that all in the congregation may know what will claim their attention during the coming twelve months. The church is thus impressed at the start that it has work to do in giving. This impression will of itself be sufficient to bring those who have benevolent impulses to the determination to give something to the various objects named in the schedule for the year; and having the whole plan for the year before them, they will

be able to make a just and fitting distribution of their gifts among the various objects claiming their benevolence. Whether such a scheme shall be formed or not usually depends on the pastor. If he has the confidence of his church, with ordinary firmness he can generally lead them to adopt some such systematic plan of giving.

The church having adopted it, shall the pastor present the claims of the different causes named in it, or shall he depend on agents to do this? Agents for gathering up the contributions of the churches, for the present, seem to be a necessity. If, however, every pastor would do his whole duty, they might be dispensed with. But many pastors as yet either do not understand their duty, or are unwilling to do it. So our great missionary societies are compelled to resort to agents, to eke out, as well as they can, the imperfect work of the pastors. But the number of our churches is now so great, that our agents, in a single year, can reach only a few of the many. And if the pastors of those churches which the agents cannot visit, in any given year, do not see that the bodies over which they preside do their duty in giving, the work is left undone. Every pastor, therefore, who can be induced to do this work, relieves the agents of our great societies from the work of addressing his church, and enables them to reach those churches whose pastors neglect the duty of presenting the claims of benevolence.

If, however, it were possible for the agents representing our great benevolent enterprises to

visit all our churches each year, this would not secure an equitable distribution of our funds. An agent representing, perchance, some comparatively unimportant enterprise, might have the gift of stirring up the emotions of his auditors, and so awakening their enthusiasm, that they might be led under his appeals to give a greater proportion than the cause which he represents relatively demands; while a more important mission work represented by some prosy, inefficient agent, might not receive its due share of funds. But if a pastor faithfully presents the various benevolences in their due order, and at stated times, the distribution of gifts among the various objects brought before his people will be more equitable, and a larger amount for benevolent purposes will unquestionably be secured; while such a course will steadily develop the disposition of the church to contribute from principle, and will do much to lift them up to the high standard of systematic giving.

It will also incidentally be of vast advantage to the pastor. He will be compelled to make himself acquainted with the work of the various mission and educational enterprises. His intelligence will thereby be increased, and his power consequently enhanced. What he acquires he will largely impart to his church, and thus both pastor and people will be brought into thorough sympathy with all the great movements for the evangelization of the world. Such sympathy will inevitably express itself in liberal giving.

The development of Christian benevolence, therefore, depends upon the spirit and teaching of our pastors more than upon all other means combined. This is the key of the whole position. Pastors who are liberal in giving, who unfold faithfully and in love all that the Bible contains on the subject of benevolence, and present from year to year the claims of missions and of Christian education, will have the joy of seeing their churches constantly growing in liberality. Of this there is no more doubt than that the thorough tillage and seasonable sowing of good soil will result ordinarily in rich and abundant harvests. In most churches where benevolence languishes, it will be found that pastors neglect the duties on which we have insisted in this paper.

How can pastors be induced to undertake this neglected work, which is the hinge-point of all our mission and educational enterprises?

First, the pastors of poor churches must be, in some way, disabused of the false notion that appeals to their churches for missions will render their own already inadequate support doubly precarious. As praying develops the spirit of prayer, so giving develops the spirit of benevolence. Cheerful giving is an experience so precious and delightful, that he who has felt it once, longs for its repetition. Hence the more Christians give, the more they are disposed to give. The pastor, who in self-forgetfulness leads his church to contribute systematically, according to their ability, to objects of general interest out-

side of themselves, will be usually himself best supported. He that loses his life saves it.

Now that pastors may be rid of this false idea, against which we have just inveighed, and may be led to do the work requisite for developing Christian benevolence, their duty ought to be set before them and urged upon them by the religious press, by discussions in ministerial conferences, associations, conventions and social unions. This agitation ought to go on, until the public sentiment on the subject shall become so positive and pronounced, that it will be as disgraceful for a minister of the gospel to neglect to preach the Scriptural doctrine of benevolence, as to fail to preach the doctrines of repentance, faith and the atonement.

Here too our theological seminaries have a duty which, in some of them, is somewhat neglected. They teach exegesis, doctrinal theology, history and homiletics, but either quite neglect pastoral duties, or teach them with little care. Young men who have no thorough training in pastoral work are sent out to take charge of churches. Something, to be sure, they have picked up by being thrown in contact with ministers and churches; but in reference to many of the most important duties of a Christian pastor they are the merest novices. Years pass away before some of them fully learn their duty in reference to the benevolence of the churches; and some of them, it is to be feared, never learn it. Would it not be well for the ablest pastors of our churches fre-

quently to give courses of lectures in our seminaries on the whole round of pastoral duties? Then, it may be, our young men might go forth better equipped for their tasks as pastors, and taking thoroughly and intelligently in hand the work of benevolence in our churches, our missions would be more abundantly supplied with funds and augmented in power, while our institutions of learning would no longer be crippled for lack of needful endowments.

I have not dwelt at all, in this paper, on the best methods of collecting money in our churches; not because these are not important; but I felt assured that no system of collecting funds could prove effective unless it was energized by a strong public sentiment. Hence I have tried to give emphasis to that which is most important. With such public sentiment awakened in favor of giving, almost any method of gathering contributions will secure great results. The apostolic method, however, so far as we can gather it from the Scriptures, was that each believer should contribute each week according as God had prospered him. And, on the whole, weekly or monthly contributions are manifestly best now. Men who work for day wages and salaries usually find it easier to pay a small sum each week or month than the aggregate of these sums for a year, at one time. And while most of those in our churches are above want, they are not rich. Many of them who would find it very inconvenient, and would probably refuse to give at any one time a large

amount, could and would give it in small sums distributed through the year. Moreover, this constant giving forms the habit of benevolence much more effectually than an extraordinary effort once in twelve months, and thus much more powerfully tends to develop the grace of giving.

But no such system of giving will run itself. When it is undertaken, the pastor, or some one else, must see to it that through committees and solicitors every member of the church is reached and that all pay the weekly or monthly subscriptions made.

Finally, if we would most effectively develop the benevolence of our churches there must be absolute fidelity in the use of the funds contributed. The money must go in straight lines to the object for which it is given. The smallest possible amount consistent with justice and the securing of the highest efficiency must be consumed on the salaries of those who serve as secretaries and agents. The most able missionaries, home and foreign, must be employed. Money expended on beneficiaries must sustain young men of piety and brains. Institutions endowed with the money of the churches must give back to the churches ministers and laymen with minds well stored, and intellects sharply disciplined. Nothing so much discourages giving as any diversion of funds or unwise expenditure of money by those who have intrusted to them the management of our benevolences; and nothing does more to encourage giving than the faithful and economical use of the

money contributed, and the successful accomplishment of the work fostered and encouraged by it.

There is money enough in our churches to carry forward the mission and educational enterprises already begun, on a much larger scale than we, as yet, have dared to undertake, without perceptibly diminishing our wealth or comforts. But all the members of our churches have not yet learned that fundamental fact of Christian experience that they and all their possessions belong to Christ, and that they are simply his stewards to dispense their wealth for his glory. When that lesson is really learned, then money for benevolent purposes will be poured out without stint. But if the churches ever learn the lesson, our pastors must teach it, enforce it, and illustrate it by their example. The Spirit, too, must be poured out mightily till Christians are lifted up out of their selfishness into Christ, and, partaking largely of his life, learn by happy experience the truth of his words, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive."

Date Due